DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 006 HE 010 988

AUTHOR Augenblick, John; Hyde, William

TITLE Patterns of Funding, Net Price and Financial Need for Postsecondary Education Students: Differences Among States, Institutional Sectors and Income Groups. Report F79-X.

INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Education Finance Center.

SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

PUB DATE Feb 79

NOTE 104p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

AVAILABLE FROM Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln St., Denver, Colorado 80295

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Financial Support; Grants; Higher Education; *Parental Financial Contribution; Student Characteristics; *Student Costs; *Student Financial Aid; *Student Loan Programs

IDENTIFIERS Alabama; Arkansas; California; *Cooperative Institute Research Program; Georgia; Louisiana; New York; North Carolina; North Dakota; Ohio; Oklahoma; Pennsylvania; South Carolina; South Dakota; Virginia

ABSTRACT

In this study on financial aid to students in higher education, descriptive data are provided on differences found among states, institutional sectors, and income groups with respect to student costs and sources of funding, the reduction in cost of attendance due to the distribution of aid, and the resulting amount of overmet or undermet financial need of students. Data for first-time, full-time undergraduate students are drawn from the 1977 annual survey of entering freshmen, called the Cooperative Institute Research Program (CIRP). States chosen for the analysis are California, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. A sixth conglomerate "state" was created by pooling data from all states that have a small state grant program. The states comprising the conglomerate are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Virginia. Estimates of the average student's budget or cost of attendance and a dollar and percentage breakdown of the major sources of funding to meet the student's costs are presented. The distribution of student financial aid and the resulting net price, the amount that a student and his family must actually pay to attend, are examined. Comparisons are made of the degree to which net price deviates from cost of attendance and of the variations in net price for states, sectors, and income groups. Data on financial aid recipients are presented, and comparisons are made of actual parental contributions with a formula-calculated expected parental contribution. (SW)

ED167006

PATTERNS OF FUNDING, NET PRICE AND FINANCIAL NEED FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION STUDENTS: DIFFERENCES AMONG STATES, INSTITUTIONAL SECTORS AND INCOME GROUPS

Report No. F79-X

BY
John Augenblick and William Hyde

Education Finance Center
Department of Research and Information
Department of Postsecondary Education

Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80295

Warren G. Hill, Executive Director

February 1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ECS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

Limited numbers of additional copies of this report may be obtained from the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln St. Denver, Colo. 80295 (303) 861-4917.

HE 010 988

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

I. COST OF ATTENDANCE AND SOURCES OF FUNDING
Cost of Attendance
Sources of Funding

II. THE EFFECT OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID UPON THE COST OF ATTENDANCE
Comparisons of Net Price and Cost of Attendance

III. STUDENT SUPPORT PROVIDED FROM GROUPED SOURCES

IV. STUDENT SUPPORT PROVIDED FROM SPECIFIC SOURCES
Public Four-Year Institutions
Public Two-Year Institutions
Private Four-Year Institutions
Private Two-Year Institutions

V. EXPECTED AND ACTUAL PARENTAL SUPPORT TO STUDENTS

SUMMARY

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

John Augenblick is the assistant director of the Education Finance Center and William Hyde is an economist in the Education Finance Center of the Education Commission of the States. Special appreciation is expressed to Ken Hunter and Lora Lee Rice, who did the computer programming and to Jennie Espinoza and Myrna Snodgrass who prepared the manuscript for printing.

The publication of this booklet was supported by funds from the Education Commission of the States, Carnegie Corporation and The Ford Foundation. The analysis and conclusions do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of these organizations.

INTRODUCTION

In the last few years, federal aid to students in higher education has expanded rapidly. A number of questions arise about the extent to which these programs affect relationships among sources of programmatic support of education and their roles. For example, to what extent does student financial aid alter disparities among states and institutional sectors in the amounts that students actually pay to attend? How great are the disparities in what students pay due to differences in family income? Have federal funds altered the purpose or commitment of states in providing financial support to higher education? How has the composition of a student's financial aid package changed because of federal programs?

There are other questions that could also be raised. It seems that many of the questions arise because there is no fundamental agreement as to what society's responsibility is to provide educational opportunities for its people, how that responsibility should be distributed within society, or how the opportunities should be defined.

In publishing this booklet, the Finance Center at the Education Commission of the States (ECS) hopes to bring more attention to these questions. As a first step, this booklet provides descriptive data on differences found among states, institutional sectors, and income groups with respect to (a) student costs and sources of funding, (b) the reduction in cost of attendance due to the distribution of aid, and

(c) the resulting amount of overmet or undermet financial need of students.

Data for the report are drawn from the 1977 annual survey of entering freshmen administered by the Higher Education Laboratory at the University of California at Los Angeles (the Cooperative Institute Research Program [CIRP]), and sponsored by the American Council on Education.* In this report, data are included only for first-time, full-time undergraduate students. The states chosen for this analysis are California, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and South Carolina.**

---

*Obtaining accurate and current data for analytic purposes is a continual problem in the social sciences. It is made more difficult when the nature of the research task requires having data on individual students. A number of shortcomings of the CIRP data are discussed in Appendix A.

**The 1977 survey includes information from nearly 300,000 students and 548 institutions. The data for the results presented in this booklet were drawn from these students. The national sample was broken down by institutional sector (two- and four-year, public and private) and state. States were selected on the basis of how many of the four sectors were represented in the state and in terms of the proportion of the institutions within a sector which was included in the national norming data.

A sixth conglomerate "state" was created by pooling data from all states that have a small state grant program. The criterion used in creating the conglomerate was that in 1975-76 the average amount of state student financial aid per student was less than $20 or that the mean dollar amount per recipient was less than $300, as reported in the 1977 edition of State Postsecondary Education Profiles Handbook (ECS, 1977, p. 254) and the ninth annual survey of the National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs (1978, p. 23). The states

students' families pay an equitable share of the costs of education. In Chapter V comparisons are made of actual parental contributions with a formula-calculated expected parental contribution. A short summary concludes the report.

comprising the conglomerate are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

The institutional sectors are the public four-year institutions, the public two-year institutions, private four-year, and private two-year institutions; students are classified by their parental income as from either a low-, middle- or high-income family. Thus, there are 72 potential sets of data (six states times four sectors times three income groups); in a sense, these data and the publication are useful for reference purposes; although the data should be relied upon only for the approximate magnitudes indicated.

Chapter I presents estimates of the average student's budget or cost of attendance and a dollar and percentage breakdown of the major sources of funding -- grants, loans, work and so on -- to meet the student's costs. Differences among states, sectors and income groups are noted. Chapter II examines the distribution of student financial aid and the resulting net price -- the amount that a student and his or her family must actually pay to attend. Comparisons are made of the degree to which net price deviates from cost of attendance and of the variations in net price for states, sectors and income groups. Chapters III through V provide data on financial aid recipients. Chapter III documents state, sector and income group disparities by recipients' major sources of funding. Chapter IV provides similar comparisons, but for several specific sources of funding under each major source. Finally, as one means of measuring the degree to which

I. COST OF ATTENDANCE AND SOURCES OF FUNDING

This chapter contains two major sections. The first section presents estimates of a student's cost of attendance for students from high-, middle- and low-income families attending public and private two- and four-year institutions in the six states. In the second section, there is an examination of the sources of funds that students have to meet the costs of attendance.

Cost of Attendance

The average cost of attendance* for a freshman, full-time student is calculated for six states and for four institutional sectors and three income groups of students' parents within each state. Of the 72 possible cost estimates, a few are not made because sufficient data are not available. The cost estimates are reported in Table 1. Data for the United States are reported in Appendix B.

*Cost of attendance is defined as the cost of tuition and fees, board and room or commuting expenses, books and supplies and any other expenditures necessary for attendance. Cost of attendance is calculated by summing for each student the amount of funds reported by the student to come from each of several sources in meeting his or her expenses.

The cost estimates presented in Table 1 are roughly comparable to budget estimates presented elsewhere. For example, student budget estimates published by the College Scholarship Service of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB), derived from expected expenses for resident students, are of the same magnitude as the cost estimates

TABLE 1

AVERAGE ANNUAL TOTAL STUDENT POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION BUDGET, AND PROPORTION OF AVERAGE BUDGET: BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE BY INCOME GROUP FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Institutional Type and Family Income Group[a]	State					
	California	New York	Ohio	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	Conglomerate[b]
Public Four-Year						
Average Budget[c]	$3,326	$5,194	$4,030	$3,462	$3,108	$3,572
Proportion of Average Budget for:						
Low Income	109.8%	85.9%	97.0%	90.0%	101.1%	87.5%
Middle Income	91.5%	107.4%	98.6%	101.6%	95.6%	101.4%
High Income	108.7%	132.6%	103.8%	117.0%	106.0%	111.3%
Public Two-Year						
Average Budget	$1,948	$3,075	$2,584	$2,990	--	$2,098
Proportion of Average Budget for:						
Low Income	102.7%	98.4%	103.4%	97.1%	--	94.3%
Middle Income	90.7%	98.8%	99.2%	99.1%	--	92.4%
High Income	116.6%	113.4%	100.0%	113.3%	--	54.6%
Private Four-Year						
Average Budget	$6,912	$6,093	$6,045	$6,035	$5,220	$5,045
Proportion of Average Budget for:						
Low Income	107.0%	98.1%	98.1%	94.3%	88.3%	91.1%
Middle Income	105.0%	100.2%	101.6%	103.2%	109.3%	100.0%
High Income	92.6%	97.6%	95.2%	98.5%	104.4%	104.2%
Private Two-Year						
Average Budget	--	$4,912	--	--	$3,632	$3,858
Proportion of Average Budget for:						
Low Income	--	94.7%	--	--	103.6%	96.3%
Middle Income	--	94.7%	--	--	100.4%	97.8%
High Income	--	137.0%	--	--	98.9%	109.7%

Note: Blanks (--) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

[c]Average budgets are calculated by weighting the budgets of the three income groups and a group of individuals not reporting income by the number of respondents in each group.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles.
Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

derived from the CIRP data. For public two-year institutions, the College Board estimates the budget to be $2,550 (CEEB, 1977, p. vii); the unweighted average across the six states reported in Table 1 is $2,539. Comparable figures for private two-year institutions are $4,015 and $4,134, respectively. For four-year institutions the budgets are correspondingly higher for both sectors, and there is a greater discrepancy between the College Board estimates and the results in Table 1. Table 1 cost estimates for public and private four-year institutions are approximately $1,000 greater than those reported by the College Board, but the significance of this difference is undetermined without disaggregating the College Board national estimates by state. The data were also sent to state officials in the states listed in Table 1 for comparison with other data that individual states might have. Few substantial differences were noted by state officials, and no systematic differences were reported among states. For example, officials in Pennsylvania thought that the budget estimates for Pennsylvania were too low; Ohio thought the estimates for Ohio to be too high.

Among states, the cost of attendance at public four-year institutions ranges from a low of $3,100 in South Carolina to $5,200 in New York. The cost at public two-year institutions is less, ranging from about $2,000 to $3,000. The average cost at private institutions is higher than the comparable public institutions, but the relative variation in costs across states is less. At private four-year institutions the cost in the state with the highest average cost (California with a cost of $6,900) is 40 percent more than the cost in

the state with the lowest average cost (the conglomerate state with a cost of $5,000). The same percentage calculated for public four-year institutions is 70 percent. Cost estimates for private two-year institutions are missing for three of the states, but New York has a high of $4,900; South Carolina and the conglomerate indicate costs of $3,600 and $3,900, respectively.

Comparisons across institutional sectors vary as one might expect. Private four-year institutions have the highest cost of attendance; private two-year institutions are the second most costly, followed by public four- and two-year institutions. Among four-year institutions, the state with the greatest cost difference is California. Average cost of attendance at a private four-year institution is $6,900, while it is $3,300 at a public four-year institution, for a difference of $3,600. New York has the smallest difference in cost of attendance -- $900. Lack of data prevent making similar comparisons for two-year institutions.

Cost of attendance among sectors and states is likely to vary because of differences in (a) tuition policies, (b) quality of education provided, and (c) cost of services. It is worth noting that private institutions, while being the most expensive, also have the least variation in cost of attendance. The reason for this is probably because variation in tuition is a major source of variation in cost of attendance, and, while private institutions have endowment funds by which to reduce tuition charges to students, the public sector may receive large institutional subsidies that translate into substantially

lower tuition charges. Since public tuition levels are often determined by state legislatures, either directly or indirectly, one can expect greater differences across states among public tuition levels than among private tuition levels.

The last comment on Table 1 is about the variation in cost of attendance among income groups. Table 1 gives the cost of attendance for students from low-, middle- and high-income families as a percentage of the average cost for each sector and state. For illustration, the estimated cost of attendance for a student attending a public four-year institution in California is $3,326. The cost for a student from a low-income family attending a public four-year institution in California is estimated at 109.8 percent of $3,326.

Of the 20 cost estimate series for the sectors in the states given in Table 1, 10 do not increase from low- to middle- to high-income group. In some of the series, the high-income group has a smaller cost than the low-income group, and in some series the middle-income group may be the group with the highest or lowest average cost of attendance. While some of the difference between a low-income and high-income student cost is due to the high-income student attending, on average, a higher priced institution within the same sector, most of the greater cost is probably due to noninstructional expenses such as board and room, travel and incidental living expenses.

Other student cost estimates generally indicate that cost of attendance increases as the income level of the student's family

increases, but most budget estimates are based on expenditures rather than resources available to meet educational costs. When budgets are computed on the basis of resources available to meet educational costs, there may be a tendency, particularly prevalent among higher income students and families, to underestimate the amount of resources that the student or family spends.

Sources of Funding

This section examines the portion of the student's costs met by various sources. The focus is on the hypothetical average student. While such a hypothetical student may never exist, this approach is useful for comparing sources and amounts of funds provided to students situated differently with respect to state residence, sector of attendance and income.

Grants, loans, earnings from work, family contribution, other federal benefits and other sources will each be discussed as a component of the student's sources of funding.

Definitions. The six sources of funds are defined as follows.

Grants include funds from the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG) program, the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) program, a state scholarship or grant, a college grant and any other private grants.

The loan category includes funds from federal guaranteed student loans (GSL), national direct student loans (NDSL), college loans and any other loans.

Earnings from work include College Work-Study (CW-S) funds, and non-CW-S funds from full-time and from part-time work, including summer employment.

The family contribution equals funds received from the student's parents, the student's savings and the student's spouse.

Other federal benefits are funds received from either the parents' or the student's veteran benefits and social security dependent's benefits.

Funds not distributed through other categories are included in other sources.

Grants. For students from families with low incomes (referred to subsequently as low-income students) and middle incomes attending private four-year institutions, grants are generally the largest single source of support although the percentage of the typical budget (cost of attendance) that is a grant varies widely, as does the average amount of the grant award. For low-income students, attending a public four-year institution, a grant constitutes as much as 55 percent (California) of the cost of attendance or as little as 31 percent (Ohio). The dollar amount of the grant varies by as much as a factor

of two, that is, from $1,000 (Pennsylvania) to $2,000 (California). Similar disparities are found among the other sectors. Considering the four sectors together, a grant may constitute as much as 60 percent of the cost of attendance for a low-income student, as in California private four-year institutions, or as little as 30 percent, as in Ohio public two-year institutions. See Tables 2 through 5 for the data on all sectors. The dollar amount of grant funds varies from $600 (in California public two-year institutions) to $4,400 (in California private four-year institutions).

For middle-income students attending private institutions, especially private four-year institutions, grants constitute about 30 percent of the average budget and are generally worth between $1,200 and $3,000. At public four-year institutions, about 10 percent of the middle-income student's budget consists of grants except in California where grants comprise nearly 18 percent of the budget. At public two-year institutions, grants consistently provide close to 10 percent of the budget in all of the states.

For the high-income student, grants constitute a lesser portion of the student budget, but the relative variation in aid awards is greater than for the low-income students. As with the middle-income students, the high-income students attending private institutions, private four-year institutions in particular, receive more grant aid than high-income students attending in other sectors because of the high costs. In public institutions, high-income students receive two to six percent of the budget in the form of grants. These figures probably

TABLE 2

AMOUNT FOR GROUPED SOURCES OF FUNDING
RECEIVED BY AN AVERAGE STUDENT (Average) AND
AMOUNT RECEIVED BY AN AVERAGE STUDENT AS A PERCENTAGE
OF THE AVERAGE STUDENT'S TOTAL BUDGET (Percent): BY FAMILY
INCOME GROUP FOR PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Family Income Group and Grouped Source of Funding[a]	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[b]	
	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent
Low Income Group												
Grant	$1,992	54.6%	$1,937	43.4%	$1,207	30.9%	$1,020	32.4%	$1,393	44.3%	$1,195	38.2%
Loan	200	5.5	435	9.8	418	10.7	484	15.4	295	9.4	360	11.5
Work	497	13.6	606	13.6	657	16.8	436	13.9	468	14.9	480	15.4
Family	769	21.1	516	11.6	1,284	32.8	953	30.3	745	23.7	828	26.5
Other Federal Benefits[c]	162	4.4	173	3.9	281	7.2	223	7.1	200	6.4	220	7.0
Other Sources	31	0.8	796	17.8	62	1.6	31	1.0	41	1.3	43	1.4
Middle Income Group												
Grant	543	17.8	552	9.4	370	9.3	353	10.0	313	10.5	484	13.4
Loan	153	5.0	662	11.9	414	10.4	643	18.3	196	6.6	396	10.9
Work	528	17.4	558	10.0	775	19.5	584	16.6	430	14.5	522	14.4
Family	1,664	54.7	1,453	26.1	2,273	57.2	1,820	51.7	1,879	63.3	2,055	56.8
Other Federal Benefits	98	3.2	75	1.3	91	2.3	68	1.9	110	3.7	110	3.0
Other Sources	57	1.9	2,306	41.4	52	1.3	51	1.4	42	1.4	54	1.5
High Income Group												
Grant	179	4.9	274	4.0	138	3.3	175	4.3	154	4.7	232	5.8
Loan	59	1.6	405	5.9	101	2.4	318	7.9	87	2.6	152	3.8
Work	471	13.0	502	7.3	602	14.4	703	17.4	411	12.5	436	11.0
Family	2,791	77.2	2,759	40.1	3,256	77.8	2,621	66.5	2,513	76.3	3,037	76.4
Other Federal Benefits	59	1.6	50	0.7	41	1.0	222	5.5	99	3.0	61	1.5
Other Sources	58	1.6	2,895	42.0	47	1.1	10	0.2	31	0.9	58	1.5

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

[c]Includes social security dependents' benefits and G.I. benefits.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 3

AMOUNT FOR GROUPED SOURCES OF FUNDING
RECEIVED BY AN AVERAGE STUDENT (Average) AND
AMOUNT RECEIVED BY AN AVERAGE STUDENT AS A PERCENTAGE
OF THE AVERAGE STUDENT'S TOTAL BUDGET (Percent): BY FAMILY
INCOME GROUP FOR PUBLIC TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Family Income Group and Grouped Source of Funding[a]	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[b]	
	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent
Low Income Group												
Grant	$ 634	31.7%	$1,019	33.7%	$ 809	30.3%	$ 963	33.2%	—	—	$1,059	38.6%
Loan	81	4.1	560	18.5	119	4.5	396	13.6	—	—	212	7.7
Work	469	23.5	405	13.4	444	16.6	428	14.7	—	—	574	20.9
Family	522	26.1	739	24.4	833	31.2	855	29.5	—	—	423	15.4
Other Federal Benefits[c]	258	12.9	235	7.8	401	15.0	225	7.8	—	—	387	14.1
Other Sources	36	1.8	68	2.2	65	2.4	36	1.2	—	—	88	3.2
Middle Income Group												
Grant	191	10.8	320	10.5	191	7.5	283	9.6	—	—	308	11.5
Loan	57	3.2	753	24.8	112	4.4	501	16.9	—	—	94	3.5
Work	605	34.2	512	16.8	628	24.5	552	18.6	—	—	704	26.2
Family	731	41.1	1,313	43.2	1,419	55.4	1,539	51.9	—	—	1,169	43.5
Other Federal Benefits	144	8.1	96	3.2	146	5.7	66	2.2	—	—	412	15.3
Other Sources	39	2.2	44	1.4	67	2.6	22	0.7	—	—	0	0.0
High Income Group												
Grant	114	5.0	149	4.3	53	2.1	86	2.5	—	—	54	3.4
Loan	102	4.5	401	11.5	34	1.3	277	8.2	—	—	19	1.2
Work	726	32.0	520	14.9	644	24.9	562	16.6	—	—	338	21.3
Family	1,148	50.6	2,298	65.9	1,826	70.7	2,400	70.8	—	—	1,099	69.3
Other Federal Benefits	129	5.7	68	1.9	22	0.9	33	1.0	—	—	58	3.7
Other Sources	52	2.3	52	1.5	5	0.2	31	0.9	—	—	19	1.2

Note: Blanks (—) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

[c]Includes social security dependents' benefits and G.I. benefits.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 4

AMOUNT FOR GROUPED SOURCES OF FUNDING RECEIVED BY AN AVERAGE STUDENT (Average) AND AMOUNT RECEIVED BY AN AVERAGE STUDENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE AVERAGE STUDENT'S TOTAL BUDGET (Percent): BY FAMILY INCOME GROUP FOR PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Family Income Group and Grouped Source of Funding[a]	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[b]	
	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent
Low Income Group												
Grant	$4,449	60.2%	$2,894	48.4%	$2,339	39.4%	$2,502	44.0%	$2,524	54.8%	$2,038	44.3%
Loan	851	11.5	1,069	17.9	1,262	21.3	1,055	18.5	401	8.7	701	15.2
Work	682	9.2	621	10.4	1,015	17.1	645	11.3	683	14.7	611	13.3
Family	1,119	15.1	1,098	18.4	992	16.7	1,194	21.0	736	16.0	981	21.3
Other Federal Benefits[c]	219	3.0	183	3.1	283	4.8	227	4.0	225	4.9	194	4.2
Other Sources	73	1.0	112	1.9	41	0.7	67	1.2	38	0.8	73	1.6
Middle Income Group												
Grant	3,109	42.8	1,679	27.5	1,257	20.5	1,523	24.5	2,019	35.4	1,200	23.8
Loan	722	10.0	1,222	20.0	1,256	20.4	1,206	19.4	614	10.8	679	13.5
Work	737	10.2	676	11.1	950	15.5	696	11.2	611	10.7	613	12.1
Family	2,489	34.3	2,343	38.4	2,474	40.3	2,649	42.5	2,263	39.7	2,354	46.7
Other Federal Benefits	105	1.4	82	1.3	124	2.0	87	1.4	67	1.2	123	2.4
Other Sources	94	1.3	106	1.7	81	1.3	68	1.1	131	2.3	77	1.5
High Income Group												
Grant	707	11.0	507	8.5	305	5.3	317	5.3	651	11.9	512	9.7
Loan	327	5.1	501	8.4	284	4.9	472	7.9	135	2.5	205	3.9
Work	614	9.6	480	8.1	533	9.3	503	8.5	364	6.7	431	8.2
Family	4,631	72.4	4,297	72.3	4,494	78.1	4,535	76.3	4,249	77.9	3,978	75.6
Other Federal Benefits	50	0.8	65	1.1	83	1.4	33	0.6	10	0.2	48	0.9
Other Sources	70	1.1	94	1.6	51	0.9	85	1.4	43	0.8	85	1.6

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

[c]Includes social security dependents' benefits and G.I. benefits.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 5

AMOUNT FOR GROUPED SOURCES OF FUNDING
RECEIVED BY AN AVERAGE STUDENT (Average) AND
AMOUNT RECEIVED BY AN AVERAGE STUDENT AS A PERCENTAGE
OF THE AVERAGE STUDENT'S TOTAL BUDGET (Percent): BY FAMILY
INCOME GROUP FOR PRIVATE TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Family Income Group and Grouped Source of Funding[a]	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[b]	
	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent	Average	Percent
Low Income Group												
Grant	--	--	$1,981	42.6%	--	--	--	--	$1,892	50.3%	$1,510	40.6%
Loan	--	--	877	18.9	--	--	--	--	197	5.2	423	11.4
Work	--	--	543	11.7	--	--	--	--	391	10.4	567	15.3
Family	--	--	720	15.5	--	--	--	--	1,107	29.4	906	24.4
Other Federal Benefits[c]	--	--	322	6.9	--	--	--	--	150	4.0	269	7.2
Other Sources	--	--	208	4.5	--	--	--	--	27	0.7	42	1.1
Middle Income Group												
Grant	--	--	1,161	25.0	--	--	--	--	1,163	31.9	753	20.0
Loan	--	--	1,171	25.2	--	--	--	--	151	4.1	461	12.2
Work	--	--	544	11.7	--	--	--	--	359	9.8	519	13.8
Family	--	--	1,664	35.8	--	--	--	--	1,776	48.7	1,909	50.6
Other Federal Benefits	--	--	59	1.3	--	--	--	--	101	2.8	83	2.2
Other Sources	--	--	53	1.1	--	--	--	--	95	2.6	47	1.2
High Income Group												
Grant	--	--	545	8.1	--	--	--	--	294	8.2	408	9.6
Loan	--	--	1,271	18.9	--	--	--	--	44	1.2	167	3.9
Work	--	--	715	10.6	--	--	--	--	353	9.8	440	10.4
Family	--	--	3,694	54.9	--	--	--	--	2,819	78.5	3,045	71.9
Other Federal Benefits	--	--	237	3.5	--	--	--	--	63	1.8	108	2.6
Other Sources	--	--	265	3.9	--	--	--	--	19	0.5	66	1.6

Note: Blanks (--) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

[c]Includes social security dependents' benefits and G.I. benefits.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles.
Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

indicate that a few students receive large awards, a portion of them merit-based.

Loans. The variation across states in the portion of the average budget filled by loans is greater than that for grants. Loans on average comprise from a few percent to 25 percent of the budget, and the dollar amount of the loan ranges from less than $100 to $1,300. For example, for public four-year institutions, loans comprise from 5 percent (California) to 15 percent (Pennsylvania) of the budget for low- and middle-income students. In private four-year institutions, loans provide from 9 percent (South Carolina) to 21 percent (Ohio) of the low-income student budget. Another example of the wide variations found is for the high-income student attending a private two-year institution. In New York, loans make up 19 percent of the budget; in South Carolina, they make up 1 percent of the budget.

However, in contrast to the grants, which decrease sharply in the higher income categories, loans provide the same magnitude of support for middle-income students as for low-income students. Even high-income students make substantial use of loans, although for high-income students the loans on average do not exceed 15 percent of the budget.

Earnings from work. The variation in the amount of the budget paid by earnings from work is less than either that for grants or loans regardless of state, sector or income group. Across states and sectors, for low-income students, 9 percent to 24 percent of the budget

consists of earnings through work. For middle-income students the range is 10 percent to 34 percent; for high-income students it is 7 percent to 32 percent. The dollar amount ranges from $300 to $1,000. In most states and sectors the range is from $400 to $700.

There are two particularly interesting observations regarding the contribution of work earnings to meeting student budgets. One is the difference between public and private institutions. Work earnings constitute a larger portion of the public student's budget than the private student's budget. At four-year institutions, the student at a public institution meets 12 to 17 percent of his or her budget through work earnings, with a few exceptions (7 percent for high-income students in New York and 20 percent for middle-income students in Ohio). At private institutions, work earnings equal 10 to 15 percent of the student's cost of attendance. Students attending public two-year institutions rely more on work earnings (about 13 to 33 percent) than students attending either private two-year institutions or public four-year institutions (10 to 15 percent).

The other observation is that high-income students at public two-year institutions rely more heavily on work earnings to meet their costs of attendance than low-income students. In the other three sectors, the trend is reversed as one would expect. Work is a form of self-help, and high-income students receive much of their funds from their parents.

The overall small deviation in earnings from work stems from two underlying conditions. One is that a full-time student can afford to spend only a certain number of hours in employment. Second, work opportunities in the CW-S are limited and therefore must be rationed. In an effort to provide each aid recipient with a self-help aid portion, financial aid officers generally spread the funds among many students. The result is that the range of earnings from work for students who receive aid is small.

Family contribution. With aid programs designed to compensate for a student's lack of ability to pay the cost of attendance, the contribution expected of the student's family to meet educational costs, of course, increases with ability to pay. There is, however, considerable variation among the states and among sectors in the proportion of the budget that the family pays. A low-income family with a student attending a public four-year institution may pay on average 12 percent (in New York) to 33 percent (in Ohio) of the budget. In dollar terms it amounts to as little as $500 or as much as $1,300. For the other three sectors, the range in the amount of the family contribution for low-income students is approximately the same.

For middle-income students, a larger portion of the budget is composed of the family contribution, and the variation is the greatest for public four-year institutions. In New York, 26 percent of the budget is from the family; in South Carolina, 63 percent. In public two-year institutions, the percentage of the budget coming from the family is close to 50 percent in all states. In private institutions,

the percentage drops to less than 50 percent, but the dollar amount of the family contribution is the same or more than for students at public institutions.

For high-income students, the percentage of the budget derived from the family is around 70 to 80 percent for private institutions and public two-year institutions. For public four-year institutions, however, the range is greater (as it is for low- and middle-income students). In Ohio, the high-income student's family contributes 78 percent of the budget. In New York it is 40 percent.

The greater percentage variation in family contribution for students attending public four-year institutions is due, to a certain extent, to state policies establishing budgets for educational systems and tuition levels. Private institutions, not subject to these state policies, consequently have a reduced range of parental contribution among states. For example, for the high-income student in New York attending a public four-year institution, the family pays on average 40 percent of the cost of attendance. In Ohio, the family pays 78 percent of the costs, although the dollar amount of the family contribution in New York and Ohio differs by only a few hundred dollars. If the student were to attend a private four-year institution instead, the family contribution would be about 77 percent, regardless of which of the two states the student is in.

Other federal benefits. Social security dependent's benefits and the veteran's G.I. benefits represent less than 10 percent of the

typical student's budget (although these sources of funds are very important for the small number of students who are recipients, as is shown in Chapter III). Typically, other federal benefits constitute 4 to 15 percent of the low-income student budget; 2 to 5 percent of the middle-income student budget (although it is 15 percent of the conglomerate); and less for the high-income student budget.

Other sources. Funds from other sources generally represent less than 2 percent of the typical budget. One major exception is for public four-year institutions in New York where this category represents 18 percent of the funding for low-income students and 41 and 42 percent, respectively, for the middle- and high-income student budgets. No explanation is currently available for this aberration.

II. THE EFFECT OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID UPON THE COST OF ATTENDANCE

In higher education there are two price systems. There is the student cost of attendance price that each student initially faces, consisting of the sum of tuition and fees, room and board or commuting costs, and other expenses necessary to attend. Many students, however, do not actually pay this price because they receive student financial aid. This revised price -- cost of attendance minus student financial aid -- is the net price and is the amount that the student and family actually pay to attend.* With the current emphasis on equalizing educational opportunity, most government aid programs, the bulk of aid, are designed to compensate low-income and needy students for their lesser ability to pay. The result is that the distribution of aid alters the price that many students actually pay to attend.

---

*Although net price has been defined elsewhere in the literature as cost of attendance minus student aid minus the expected parental amount, this definition is misleading. Determination of the amount that a family is expected to contribute is no more than a value judgment and is more related to the concept of "need" than to price.

In trying to determine how much aid a student should receive, and thus what the net price should be for a student, two value judgments are made. One is to decide how much the student's family should be expected to contribute to meeting the student's costs, and the other is to decide how much the student should contribute, often referred to as the self-help portion.

There is ambiguity about what constitutes a grant and self-help. Loans, for example, may be considered part self-help and part grant.

If loans were obtained at market interest rates and without grace provisions, a loan would be entirely self-help, but the federal loan programs are subsidized and students receive partial grants in the form of reduced interest rates, grace periods, and special waivers of payment. The net effect is that a "loan" is about half loan and half grant. A similar argument can be made for earnings under the CW-S program although no estimate exists for the amount that is grant or self-help. For this analysis, net price consists of actual family contribution and student or spouse savings and earnings used to meet educational costs.

If student financial aid programs were funded at the ideal level, net price would equal the sum of the expected parental contribution plus the student's expected self-help amount for each student. In practice, of course, there is no agreement on what the ideal level of support should be and programs are often underfunded, resulting in students paying more than what is "expected." General sentiment over the past few years has been that net price should be positively related to wealth, income, or some measure of ability to pay. The data in Table 6 indicate that this relationship exists for the states, sectors, and income groups.*

*For comparison, similar data are reported in Appendix B for the United States.

The first figure in the table should be read as follows. For a low-income student attending a public four-year institution in

TABLE 6

NET PRICE (AMOUNT) AND NET PRICE AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE AVERAGE ANNUAL TOTAL STUDENT POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION BUDGET (PERCENT): BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE BY INCOME GROUP FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Institutional Type and Family Income Group[a]	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[b]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Public Four-Year												
Low Income	$1,266	35%	$1,122	25%	$1,941	50%	$1,389	44%	$1,213	39%	$1,308	42%
Middle Income	2,192	72	2,011	36	3,048	77	2,404	68	2,309	78	2,577	71
High Income	3,262	90	3,261	47	3,858	92	3,324	82	2,924	89	3,473	87
Public Two-Year												
Low Income	991	50	1,144	38	1,277	48	1,283	44	--	--	997	36
Middle Income	1,336	76	1,825	60	2,047	80	2,091	71	--	--	1,873	70
High Income	1,874	83	2,818	81	2,470	96	2,962	87	--	--	1,437	91
Private Four-Year												
Low Income	1,801	24	1,719	29	2,007	34	1,839	32	1,419	31	1,592	35
Middle Income	3,226	44	3,019	49	3,424	56	3,345	54	2,874	50	2,967	59
High Income	5,245	82	4,777	80	5,027	87	5,038	85	4,613	85	4,409	84
Private Two-Year												
Low Income	--	--	1,263	27	--	--	--	--	1,498	40	1,473	40
Middle Income	--	--	2,208	47	--	--	--	--	2,135	59	2,428	64
High Income	--	--	4,409	66	--	--	--	--	3,172	88	3,485	82

Note: Blanks (--) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.
Net price consists of actual family contribution and student or spouse savings or work earnings used to meet educational costs.

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles.
Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

California the average net price is $1,266 which is 35 percent of the cost of attendance ($3,651) represented in Table 1.

Variations in net price. For low-income students at public four-year institutions, net price ranges from $1,100 in New York to $1,900 in Ohio. Among public two-year institutions the range is smaller, from $1,000 to $1,300. For private four-year institutions, the range is from $1,400 in South Carolina to $2,000 in Ohio. Net price for private two-year institutions is about $1,400. For middle- and high-income students, net price is greater. Middle-income students often pay $1,000 more than low-income students, and high-income students pay $1,000 more than middle-income students.

Net price for different income groups also varies from state to state. In California and New York, for example, the net price for a low-income student attending a private four-year institution is about 50 percent more than the net price of attending a public four-year institution. For a high-income student, the increase is also about 50 percent. In Ohio, however, and to a lesser extent in South Carolina and the conglomerate, net price for a low-income student at a four-year public institution is nearly the same as for a private institution. The disparity in net price in these three states increases for higher income students.

Comparisons of Net Price and Cost of Attendance

Table 6 also gives net price as a percentage of cost of attendance, as reported in Table 1, and the percentages show that net price is from 24 to 96 percent of the cost of attendance, the greatest reductions being for low-income groups.

A comparison of the patterns of net price and cost of attendance (Table 1 and 6), reveals the increase in variation in net price across income groups created by the distribution of student financial aid. In Table 1 all budgets in a particular sector and state are within about 10 percent of each other. Net prices, however, range widely. The net price for the high-income group is at least twice the net price for the low-income group and in many instances the ratio is three to one.

It is also worth noting that the conglomerate, a group of pooled states with small state student financial aid programs, achieves the same degree of progressiveness of net price across income groups as do the other states.

The Effect of Financial Aid Upon State, Sectoral and Income Cost Disparities

A more useful, detailed examination of the effect of student financial aid on reducing price disparities across states and sectors can be made by comparing the differences in range in cost of attendance and net price and by computing the percentage change in the differences. To measure the variation in each sector, the ratio of the

state with the lowest cost of attendance to the state with the highest cost of attendance is calculated for each income group. The same ratios are computed for net price. Each ratio is then subtracted from one. Thus, the smaller the ratio, the less disparity in cost or price. Finally, as a measure of the change in dispersion, the percentage change between each cost index and its corresponding net price index is calculated. These results are given in Table 7.

To illustrate, Table 7 is read as follows. The index of variation in cost of attendance (cost index) for low-income students attending public four-year institutions is .30. It is seen that the cost index increases with income except for private four-year institutions, for which the index decreases with income. That is, although the cost of attendance at private four-year institutions is greater than the cost of attendance at other institutions, the difference between the state with the lowest cost of attendance for private four-year institutions and the state with the highest cost of attendance for private four-year institutions is greater for low-income students than higher income students. Furthermore, the cost index for low-income students at private four-year institutions is greater than the cost index for low-income students attending any of the other sectors.

The index of variation in net price (net price index) varies irregularly across income groups, but the index is particularly large for low-income students attending public four-year institutions (.42) and high-income students attending public two-year institutions (.53). The smallest indices are found for low- and middle-income students at

TABLE 7

INDEX OF VARIATION IN COST AND NET PRICE
AND THE PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN VARIATION
COST AND NET PRICE BY SECTOR BY INCOME GROUP

Family Income Group[a]	Public Four-Year	Public Two-Year	Private Four-Year	Private Two-Year	All Sectors
		Cost			
Low Income	.30	.34	.38	.20	.31
Middle Income	.47	.42	.30	.22	.35
High Income	.52	.55	.18	.47	.43
		Net Price			
Low Income	.42	.23	.30	.13	.27
Middle Income	.33	.38	.15	.12	.25
High Income	.26	.53	.15	.27	.30
		Percentage Change			
Low Income	40	-32	-21	-35	-13
Middle Income	-11	-10	-50	-45	-29
High Income	-50	-4	-17	-43	-30

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

private two-year institutions (.13 and .12, respectively) and for middle- and high-income students at private four-year institutions (both .15).

The effectiveness of student financial aid to reduce the range in the amount that a student actually pays can be seen in the bottom third of Table 7. Financial aid reduces the range of prices in all instances except for low-income students in public four-year institutions with the reductions in range of price generally greater for high-income than low-income students. Averaging across all institutional sectors, the variation in net price is 13 percent less than the variation in cost of attendance for low-income students. For high-income students, the reduction is 30 percent. The large percentage improvement for high-income students is partially attributable to the fact that the high-income student cost indices are higher than those for low-income students. That is, the variation for low-income student budgets is less to begin with; consequently it is more difficult for a low-income group than a high-income group to obtain a given percentage reduction in variation.

Corresponding cost and net price indices are made for differences from institutional sector to institutional sector within each state and given in Table 8. The cost and net price indices across sectors present different results. First, the cost index varies from state to state. In California, the index is generally high -- .73 for low-income students and .65 for high-income students -- (indicating a wide disparity among sectors in cost) and in South Carolina the index

TABLE 8

INDEX OF VARIATION IN BUDGETS AND NET PRICES
AND THE PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN VARIATION
BETWEEN BUDGET AND NET PRICE BY STATE BY INCOME GROUP

Family Income Group[a]	State						All States
	California	New York	Ohio	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	Conglomerate[b]	
				Budget			
Income	.73	.49	.55	.48	.32	.40	.49
ddle Income	.76	.50	.58	.52	.48	.47	.55
gh Income	.65	.49	.55	.43	.40	.70	.50
				Net Price			
Income	.45	.35	.36	.30	.19	.37	.34
ddle Income	.59	.40	.40	.37	.26	.37	.40
gh Income	.64	.41	.51	.41	.37	.67	.47
				Percent Change			
Income	-38	-29	-35	-38	-41	-8	-31
ddle Income	-22	-20	-31	-29	-46	-21	-27
gh Income	-2	-16	-7	-5	-8	-4	-6

ncome groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle come = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or eater than $30,000.

ooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, lahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

urce: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles.
Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

ranges from .32 to .48. The overall average for the six states is .49 for low-income students, .55 for middle-income students and .50 for high-income students.

Second, the variations in net price are less than the variations in cost for every state and every income group, but the overall average net price index for the six states does increase with income from .34 to .47. Student financial aid, as with the cross-state comparisons, reduces cost discrepancies across institutional sectors, but the reductions are less for high-income students (6 percent) than for low-income students (31 percent) or middle-income students (27 percent).

Comparing Tables 7 and 8, it is shown that the cost index is less for particular sectors (Table 7) than for the various sectors within a particular state (Table 8). While some variation can be expected among states due to individual state policies regarding education, variation among sectors is known to be substantial. The common example is the cost difference between a public two-year and a private four-year institution. Net price indices also are larger across sectors than across states.

The tables also show that for a particular sector across the states, student financial aid (as reflected in the net price index) tends to equalize for all income groups the degree of net price disparities (Table 7). From sector to sector within a particular state, the distribution of financial aid tends to equalize the degree

of net price disparities more for low-income students than for higher income students (Table 8).

In sum, student financial aid reduces the price of education for many students, and the reductions are the greatest for low-income students. Net price on average is 35 percent to 40 percent of the cost of attendance for low-income students and increases for higher income students. Student financial aid also reduces the range in price to the student, from one sector to another as well as from state to state although the sector-to-sector net price disparities of a particular state are greater than state-to-state disparities for particular institutional sectors.

TABLE 9

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR GROUPED SOURCES OF FUNDING: BY FAMILY INCOME GROUP
FOR PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Family Income Group and Grouped Source of Funding[a]	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[b]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Low Income Group												
Grant	$2,327	85.7%	$2,128	91.0%	$1,518	79.5%	$1,255	81.4%	$1,663	83.7%	$1,425	83.9%
Loan	868	23.1	1,424	30.6	1,052	39.8	1,175	41.2	838	35.2	974	37.0
Work	659	75.6	784	77.4	784	83.9	548	79.9	722	64.9	658	72.9
Family	941	81.5	690	74.8	1,459	88.1	1,130	84.4	877	85.0	1,005	82.3
Other Federal Benefits[c]	877	18.6	807	21.6	1,054	26.6	942	23.8	773	25.9	874	25.2
Other Sources	697	4.5	3,903	20.4	891	7.0	682	4.5	559	7.5	693	6.2
Middle Income Group												
Grant	1,016	53.5	764	68.5	937	39.6	850	41.7	901	34.8	1,068	45.3
Loan	1,038	14.8	1,445	45.9	1,327	31.2	1,734	37.1	940	21.0	1,283	30.8
Work	652	81.2	657	85.2	898	86.4	720	81.3	613	70.1	684	76.2
Family	1,723	96.6	1,591	91.4	2,341	97.1	1,914	95.1	1,932	97.3	2,130	96.5
Other Federal Benefits	996	10.1	874	8.6	1,090	8.3	856	7.9	1,129	9.8	1,191	9.2
Other Sources	1,037	5.5	4,670	49.4	1,079	4.8	1,217	4.2	1,038	4.0	1,198	4.5
High Income Group												
Grant	720	25.1	602	45.5	733	18.8	888	19.8	941	16.4	1,075	21.7
Loan	896	6.6	1,449	28.1	1,066	9.6	1,786	17.9	1,159	7.7	1,475	10.3
Work	629	75.1	647	77.7	774	77.9	859	82.0	640	64.1	630	69.3
Family	2,839	98.4	2,922	94.5	3,305	98.6	2,705	96.9	2,603	96.6	3,081	98.6
Other Federal Benefits	1,130	5.4	1,034	4.9	673	6.1	1,892	11.7	1,549	6.4	1,337	4.6
Other Sources	1,069	5.4	4,883	59.3	1,340	3.5	500	2.0	717	4.4	1,416	4.1

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

[c]Includes social security dependents' benefits and G.I. benefits.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

III. STUDENT SUPPORT PROVIDED FROM GROUPED SOURCES

Having examined the sources of funding for the average student's educational budget, it is appropriate to look at the distribution of support received from the same sources for those actually receiving any support. It is improbable that the amount and sources of funds that students actually receive are the same as those for the hypothetical average student. The differences between the states, between institutional sectors, and between income groups become more obvious when the distinction between recipients and nonrecipients of funding sources is made. One of the best indicators of such differences is the average amount received by recipients from each source and the probability of being a recipient at all. These statistics are not indicative of the wide variations within particular types of students in either the amounts of support received from particular sources or the ways in which funding sources interact.

The data in Tables 9 through 12 show the average amount of funds received by students actually receiving any amount and the probability of receiving any amount for each of the grouped sources of funding discussed in the previous chapter. The tables display these figures for different institutional sectors and, within each table, differences among the states and income groups can be determined. The probability of receiving any amount of funds is determined by dividing the total number of individuals receiving any funds from a particular source by the total number of individuals who either do or do not receive funds from that source.

TABLE 10

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR GROUPED SOURCES OF FUNDING: BY FAMILY INCOME GROUP
FOR PUBLIC TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Family Income Group and Grouped Source of Funding[a]	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[b]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Low Income Group												
Grant	$1,063	59.7%	$1,283	79.4%	$1,136	71.2%	$1,192	80.7%	--	--	$1,244	85.1%
Loan	811	10.1	1,399	40.2	961	12.6	1,132	35.0	--	--	1,451	14.6
Work	600	71.0	569	71.3	602	73.8	582	73.5	--	--	1,070	53.6
Family	693	75.6	928	79.9	1,023	81.5	1,020	83.9	--	--	633	66.9
Other Federal Benefits[c]	995	26.1	912	26.0	1,192	33.6	1,007	22.4	--	--	1,023	37.8
Other Sources	583	6.3	844	8.1	737	8.8	583	6.1	--	--	1,283	6.9
Middle Income Group												
Grant	799	24.3	616	51.9	685	28.0	639	44.5	--	--	896	34.2
Loan	619	9.5	1,632	46.2	960	11.7	1,436	34.9	--	--	894	10.4
Work	727	83.3	648	79.1	729	86.3	676	81.8	--	--	951	74.0
Family	832	88.0	1,416	92.7	1,463	97.0	1,634	94.4	--	--	1,258	92.9
Other Federal Benefits	1,053	13.7	890	10.7	1,455	10.0	887	7.4	--	--	2,625	15.7
Other Sources	723	5.5	806	5.5	1,070	6.3	592	3.7	--	--	0	0
High Income Group												
Grant	1,083	10.6	521	28.9	350	15.3	567	15.3	--	--	375	14.3
Loan	2,065	4.9	1,471	27.3	1,000	3.5	1,667	16.7	--	--	135	14.3
Work	929	78.3	701	74.2	905	71.2	717	78.3	--	--	601	56.3
Family	1,232	93.3	2,364	97.3	1,854	98.6	2,466	97.4	--	--	1,159	94.7
Other Federal Benefits	1,244	10.6	736	9.5	312	7.3	527	6.4	--	--	404	14.3
Other Sources	708	7.4	990	5.3	250	2.0	1,000	3.1	--	--	250	7.7

Note: Blanks (--) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

[c]Includes social security dependents' benefits and G.I. benefits.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 11

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR GROUPED SOURCES OF FUNDING: BY FAMILY INCOME GROUP
FOR PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Family Income Group and Grouped Source of Funding[a]	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[b]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Low Income Group												
Grant	$4,701	94.7%	$3,069	94.4%	$2,660	88.0%	$2,742	91.3%	$2,565	98.4%	$2,224	91.6%
Loan	1,219	69.8	1,613	66.3	1,758	72.0	1,664	63.5	1,298	30.9	1,164	60.3
Work	817	83.4	760	81.9	1,079	94.1	782	82.4	852	80.0	786	77.7
Family	1,350	82.8	1,318	83.4	1,191	83.3	1,390	85.9	921	80.0	1,156	84.8
Other Federal Benefits[c]	962	22.8	955	19.1	1,040	27.2	990	23.0	798	28.3	901	21.5
Other Sources	1,186	6.2	1,271	8.8	759	5.4	1,135	5.9	545	7.0	914	8.0
Middle Income Group												
Grant	3,599	86.3	2,018	83.2	1,874	67.1	2,078	73.3	2,434	83.1	1,667	72.1
Loan	1,233	58.2	1,869	65.5	2,035	61.7	1,947	62.0	1,450	42.3	1,496	45.4
Work	865	85.2	788	85.8	1,045	91.0	820	84.7	792	76.9	795	77.2
Family	2,579	96.5	2,435	96.2	2,575	96.1	2,732	97.0	2,351	96.3	2,434	96.7
Other Federal Benefits	1,017	10.5	894	9.2	1,276	9.9	1,141	7.7	714	9.4	1,333	9.2
Other Sources	1,618	5.8	1,469	7.2	1,333	6.1	1,411	4.8	1,330	10.0	1,172	6.6
High Income Group												
Grant	1,619	42.4	1,087	46.6	1,130	27.1	1,347	23.5	1,698	38.3	1,203	42.5
Loan	1,528	21.4	1,752	28.7	1,854	15.5	2,051	23.0	1,192	11.4	1,464	14.0
Work	853	72.1	689	69.8	730	73.2	676	74.5	596	61.0	668	64.5
Family	4,686	98.8	4,367	98.5	4,572	98.3	4,578	99.1	4,280	99.3	4,029	98.7
Other Federal Benefits	753	7.1	924	6.9	1,670	4.9	788	4.2	438	2.3	885	5.4
Other Sources	2,072	3.4	2,100	4.7	1,672	3.2	1,925	4.4	1,875	2.3	1,628	5.3

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

[c]Includes social security dependents' benefits and G.I. benefits.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 12

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR GROUPED SOURCES OF FUNDING: BY FAMILY INCOME GROUP
FOR PRIVATE TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Family Income Group and Grouped Source of Funding[a]	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[b]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Low Income Group												
Grant	--	--	$2,147	92.3%	--	--	--	--	$2,139	88.5%	$1,728	87.4%
Loan	--	--	1,619	54.2	--	--	--	--	636	31.1	1,019	41.6
Work	--	--	692	78.6	--	--	--	--	573	68.5	725	78.2
Family	--	--	955	75.5	--	--	--	--	1,192	92.9	1,062	85.3
Other Federal Benefits[c]	--	--	1,033	31.1	--	--	--	--	567	26.5	1,078	25.0
Other Sources	--	--	1,550	13.4	--	--	--	--	500	5.5	562	7.5
Middle Income Group												
Grant	--	--	1,560	74.6	--	--	--	--	1,778	65.6	1,076	70.0
Loan	--	--	1,872	62.6	--	--	--	--	766	19.9	1,323	34.9
Work	--	--	687	79.3	--	--	--	--	594	60.7	705	73.8
Family	--	--	1,897	87.8	--	--	--	--	1,825	97.3	2,001	95.4
Other Federal Benefits	--	--	867	6.9	--	--	--	--	1,303	7.9	769	10.8
Other Sources	--	--	806	6.6	--	--	--	--	1,273	7.5	1,083	4.3
High Income Group												
Grant	--	--	1,169	46.7	--	--	--	--	744	39.5	901	45.4
Loan	--	--	2,737	46.4	--	--	--	--	889	5.1	1,271	13.1
Work	--	--	1,056	67.7	--	--	--	--	664	53.3	744	59.1
Family	--	--	4,048	91.3	--	--	--	--	2,956	95.4	3,201	95.1
Other Federal Benefits	--	--	1,583	15.0	--	--	--	--	630	10.0	948	11.4
Other Sources	--	--	5,000	5.3	--	--	--	--	750	2.6	833	7.9

Note: Blanks (--) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

[c]Includes social security dependents' benefits and G.I. benefits.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

Looking at the level of grants received by those students attending public four-year institutions in Table 9, it is shown that among low-income families, students have a consistently high probability of receiving grant funds. Between 80 and 90 percent of all students from low-income families receive grants. However, the amount of the average award varies between the states by a ratio of almost 2:1. The average amount of grant received is much higher for students attending institutions in California and New York as compared to the other states. For students from middle-income families, the probability of receiving any grant generally decreases to between 40 and 55 percent although the variation among the states is greater than the variation among states found for students from high-income families. The average grant award, however, is somewhat more uniform across the states for middle-income in comparison to high-income students. Middle-income students attending institutions in New York have a greater chance of receiving an award, than students in the other states, although the average award in New York is smaller. The pattern for students from high-income families is similar to that for students from middle-income families, although the average award declines by approximately 50 percent and the probabilities of receiving a grant decrease to approximately 20 percent. High-income students attending public four-year institutions in New York have a much greater chance of receiving a grant compared to similar students in the other states examined.

The chance of receiving a loan is generally between 30 and 40 percent for low- and middle-income students attending public four-year

contribution to such students in Ohio is twice as high as that in New York.

The proportion of students receiving funds through federal sources, other than through Office of Education programs, is similar across the states. The proportion, however, decreases as family income increases, although average benefits tend to increase with family income. Generally, less than 5 percent of the students receive funds from sources other than those previously discussed, although recipients receive large amounts of such funds. However, the proportion of students in New York who receive funds from other sources increases from 20 to 60 percent between the low- and high-income groups and the average benefit is very large, between $4,000 and $5,000.

The patterns of support for students attending public two-year institutions, as shown in Table 10, are similar to those of students attending public four-year institutions, with a few notable exceptions. The proportion of students from low-income families that receive grants is generally lower, very much lower in California, for students in public two-year as compared to public four-year institutions. However, the amount of the average award is similar across the states, reflecting the consistently low tuition levels of public two-year institutions. Among high-income students, the size of the average grant varies enormously across the states. Students in California receive an average grant that is nearly three times as large as that received in Ohio.

institutions and is significantly lower for students attending institutions in California. For high-income students the probability of receiving a loan drops to around 10 percent in California, Ohio, South Carolina and the conglomerate.

The average amount of loan increases as income decreases in Pennsylvania, South Carolina and the conglomerate. In New York the average loan received is constant across income groups and in California and Ohio, middle-income students receive the highest loans.

The chance of receiving funds through work generally is between 70 and 90 percent for all students attending public four-year institutions. The average amount of funds derived through employment is generally between $600 and $800. Low- and middle-income students in Ohio receive much higher amounts through work compared to similar students in the other states.

For family support the probability of receiving any funds is greater than 75 percent for all students. A notable increase in that probability occurs between the low- and middle-income groups. The average magnitude of family support varies substantially across the states and income groups. In general, middle-income students receive about twice as much support from their families as low-income students, and students in the high-income group receive approximately $1,000 more from their families than students in the middle-income group. The variation in family provided support for low-income students is particularly high among the states. For example, the average family

There is little variation among states in the proportion of low-income students receiving grants, either in private four-year or private two-year institutions. Approximately 90 percent of such students receive grants. However, variations do exist among states in the amount of grant aid received by low-income students, with private four-year students in New York and California receiving $500 and $1,000 more, respectively, as grant support compared to the other states. Compared to public institutions, a much higher proportion of middle- and high-income students attending private institutions receive grants. However, there is much more variation among the states in such proportions for high-income, in comparison to middle-income students. Interstate variations in the average grant award received are small for middle- and high-income students attending private institutions. Middle-income students in California receive significantly higher awards, however.

Students attending private institutions generally have a much greater probability of receiving a loan than students attending public institutions, with less variation among the states in such probabilities. In California, Ohio and the conglomerate the chance of a private four-year student receiving a loan decreases as income increases. In New York and Pennsylvania such chances are constant for low- and middle-income students, decreasing significantly for high-income students. In South Carolina the probabilities of receiving loans are lower than other states at all income levels and they increase between the low- and middle-income groups before decreasing to their lowest level for high-income students. The magnitude of the

The chance that a student attending a public two-year institution receives a loan is generally lower across all income groups, as compared to students attending public four-year institutions, and more variable among the states. Students in New York and Pennsylvania have much higher probabilities of receiving loans of generally higher value, than do students in the other states examined.

While the probabilities of receiving a parental contribution are generally the same for students attending either the two- or four-year public sectors, the amount of such support is much lower for students attending two-year institutions. More importantly, there is much greater uniformity in the parental contribution across income groups for students attending public two-year institutions. Variation among the states in the magnitude of family support to students attending two-year institutions is somewhat larger for high-income students than for low- or middle-income students.

There are significant differences in the patterns of support for students attending private institutions, as shown in Tables 11 and 12, compared to students attending public institutions. Wider variations exist between the states in the way support is provided to students attending private institutions compared to such variations for students attending public institutions. Neither of these findings are unexpected given the traditional differences among states in the way private institutions are supported and the higher costs associated with attendance at private institutions.

IV. STUDENT SUPPORT PROVIDED FROM SPECIFIC SOURCES

While it is of interest to examine the probabilities of receiving aid and the average amounts of aid received for broad categories of sources of support, as is done in the previous chapter, it is also important to know the probabilities and amounts for specific programs within those broad categories. This is true for two reasons: first, it is of interest to know how individual student aid programs allocate funds and second, the major sources of public support can be defined in terms of a federal, state or institutional locus. Each of these sources of funds is likely to differ in terms of goals, eligibility requirements, available funds, and distributional mechanisms. Clearly, the need for student financial aid at all is related to decisions that states make about institutional subsidy levels and tuition levels and that private institutions make about endowment use and tuition levels. While the federal Basic Grant, for instance, is viewed by some as being at the apex of the grant system, it is important to recognize that the Basic Grant program is responsive to other decisions made in states or by institutions, either to support public institutions at particular levels or to use endowment funds to reduce tuition levels at private institutions. Thus, the student aid system can be viewed as circular, with decisions by all parties affecting all other parties to some extent. A major criticism of the current system is, in fact, that decisions about individual programs appear so often to be made independently. It therefore is of some value to examine how individual student aid programs operate and how they interact with other programs.

average loan received by a private four-year student does not vary greatly across income groups within states, but there is some variation among states in the extent of loan support. Loan magnitude varies widely among states for students attending private two-year institutions, with students in New York receiving loans 50 to 100 percent higher than those received by students in South Carolina or the conglomerate.

A greater proportion of students attending private four-year institutions receive funds through working compared to students attending public four-year institutions. In addition, the amount of such funds is somewhat greater for students attending private institutions, particularly in the case of low-income students. There is little variation among the states in either the probabilities of receiving or magnitude of work funds for students attending private institutions.

With the exception of Ohio, low-income students attending private four-year institutions receive more funds from their families than their peers attending public institutions. Among middle- and high-income students, family support is about 50 percent greater for students attending private institutions although the probabilities of receiving such funds are similar. For students attending private institutiuons, there is much less interstate variability in the magnitude of family support across all income groups. The pattern for other sources of funding is similar when comparing public and private institutions.

The data presented in Tables 13 through 24 indicate the probabilities of receiving any amount of support and the average amount of support received from certain programs within the broad categories of funds defined earlier. For grants, this information is shown for the federal BEOG program; the federal SEOG program; state grant programs, including need-based, merit-based or combination programs and including funds provided by the federal government on a matching basis to the states for their distribution under the State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) program; institutional funds, whatever their original source; and other private sources. For loans, data are available for the NDSL and the GSL programs; institutional loan programs; and other loan sources. Funds acquired through student work are divided into those derived from full-time work, part-time work and those derived from participation in the CW-S program. Family resources are divided into those received from parents, spouses and student savings. Veterans benefits received under the G.I. Bill and social security benefits are disaggregated from other federal benefits.

The tables are ordered so that, within each institutional sector, separate tables display data for low-, middle- and high-income students. Tables 13, 14 and 15 refer to public four-year institutions. Tables 16, 17 and 18 refer to public two-year institutions; Tables 19, 20 and 21, to private four-year institutions; and Tables 22, 23 and 24, to private two-year institutions.

TABLE 13

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM LOW INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	$1,014	62.4%	$1,195	82.7%	$ 953	62.1%	$ 882	61.3%	$1,196	77.7%	$ 998	73.8%
SEOG	1,006	34.0	940	35.6	496	23.6	507	14.3	648	31.3	492	24.5
State	852	62.4	734	38.2	525	43.6	493	54.7	957	10.0	524	27.3
Institutional	876	31.7	883	24.9	708	21.0	397	15.7	785	9.7	740	15.9
Private	814	25.4	958	11.6	779	15.4	507	14.8	783	11.4	709	11.1
Loan												
NDSL	822	14.0	973	12.1	694	21.2	518	16.5	497	17.3	650	18.5
GSL	1,058	3.0	1,148	15.2	1,275	11.7	1,250	22.9	947	8.8	1,185	10.2
Institutional	667	4.8	828	10.3	665	7.9	533	9.5	782	9.0	708	8.9
Other	1,094	1.9	1,018	5.7	1,075	6.5	922	6.7	975	5.7	917	6.1
Work												
Full-Time	969	5.6	914	10.6	831	9.3	525	4.1	794	6.5	743	6.3
Part-Time	429	63.9	450	59.2	552	72.8	450	70.1	460	47.3	451	52.4
CW-S	884	19.1	708	34.3	640	27.8	472	21.3	828	24.0	544	36.0
Family												
Parents	804	66.5	669	55.3	1,177	72.0	944	70.5	758	73.4	878	70.3
Savings	418	51.1	504	27.7	653	63.8	517	55.2	446	41.1	483	40.8
Spouse	2,750	0.7	450	1.4	962	2.1	250	1.2	300	1.9	788	1.6
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	643	3.2	650	2.9	833	3.1	1,211	5.1	904	5.0	989	3.8
GI (Student)	1,500	0.2	1,202	2.5	1,554	1.8	708	2.4	2,111	1.7	1,173	2.6
Social Security	880	15.8	793	15.7	1,017	22.3	730	19.8	572	20.8	742	20.6
Other Sources	697	4.5	3,902	20.4	891	7.0	682	4.5	559	7.4	693	6.2

Note: Low income = total annual income less than $12,500.

[a] Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 14

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	$ 625	10.6%	$ 554	35.0%	$ 680	14.4%	$ 653	17.3%	$ 779	16.5%	$ 765	17.7%
SEOG	970	3.6	428	12.7	612	4.3	762	3.8	432	3.2	489	5.8
State	583	25.9	346	39.3	559	10.9	435	21.7	826	5.4	642	13.1
Institutional	609	21.0	566	13.0	763	11.0	729	4.3	1,119	6.1	918	15.0
Private	675	24.1	498	13.1	752	13.4	880	9.8	684	8.4	769	12.9
Loan												
NDSL	902	7.0	970	19.5	864	12.7	1,153	8.2	743	5.8	749	10.8
GSL	1,396	2.6	1,171	23.2	1,618	10.0	1,752	21.6	1,204	4.9	1,481	11.7
Institutional	775	1.8	617	6.9	716	4.6	795	4.2	644	3.9	691	5.3
Other	1,468	2.7	1,313	12.1	1,458	7.5	1,242	11.1	1,250	5.5	1,330	7.8
Work												
Full-Time	1,090	5.6	862	8.5	1,140	10.9	1,019	9.9	656	7.3	806	6.5
Part-Time	516	76.8	490	77.5	726	80.5	576	75.1	487	62.8	564	69.3
CW-S	994	7.2	491	21.5	660	10.2	395	13.0	739	10.3	645	12.1
Family												
Parents	1,460	91.1	1,315	83.1	1,914	89.1	1,648	86.3	1,647	94.0	1,827	91.9
Savings	511	64.8	594	57.8	769	72.7	597	65.3	625	50.9	613	58.4
Spouse	3,000	0.1	1,312	1.3	1,161	0.8	1,187	0.7	875	1.5	1,326	1.3
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	896	1.1	1,000	2.1	1,333	1.1	781	1.5	1,050	3.7	1,296	1.8
GI (Student)	250	0.1	1,375	1.1	1,885	0.6	1,333	0.5	2,400	0.7	1,824	1.0
Social Security	1,175	7.4	1,028	3.8	1,176	5.5	1,080	4.5	1,000	5.4	1,137	6.1
Other Sources	1,037	5.5	4,669	49.4	1,078	4.8	1,217	4.2	1,038	4.0	1,198	4.5

Note: Middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 15

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM HIGH INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	$ 592	2.8%	$ 631	10.8%	$ [illegible]	3.0%	$ 900	4.4%	$ 500	3.0%	$ 908	4.0%
SEOG	563	0.6	361	4.9	722	0.5	250	1.8	250	0.3	1,375	0.6
State	793	3.4	303	30.5	731	2.1	708	5.5	1,050	2.8	846	3.3
Institutional	539	9.2	750	6.9	837	5.1	500	1.9	1,917	4.1	1,181	7.6
Private	645	13.1	969	4.5	789	6.3	1,125	7.4	717	4.2	1,064	6.7
Loan												
NDSL	1,300	0.7	1,062	6.4	1,369	1.2	3,000	0.9	3,000	0.3	1,025	1.5
GSL	1,055	1.3	1,817	13.7	1,690	3.0	1,396	10.9	1,694	2.5	1,781	4.9
Institutional	1,167	0.4	321	3.8	727	0.6	250	0.9	875	0.5	632	1.0
Other	1,195	2.6	875	8.7	1,328	2.3	2,107	6.5	1,469	2.2	1,793	2.4
Work												
Full-Time	1,182	6.5	1,068	6.2	1,066	7.4	1,271	11.5	808	7.5	828	5.1
Part-Time	543	71.3	570	74.2	695	74.2	687	74.8	568	59.6	584	65.2
CW-S	833	0.9	250	5.3	596	1.3	792	5.5	444	2.5	559	2.4
Family												
Parents	2,544	96.5	2,553	91.0	2,893	95.4	2,371	91.1	2,328	94.5	2,784	97.0
Savings	576	57.4	707	61.7	757	63.3	664	61.9	728	42.7	622	52.7
Spouse	5,000	0.1	0	0	1,557	1.1	5,000	0.1	750	0.3	1,231	0.7
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	750	1.0	1,833	1.6	1,028	0.5	3,000	0.1	1,000	2.2	1,633	1.5
GI (Student)	750	0.3	1,625	1.1	1,417	0.3	3,000	0.1	2,250	0.6	2,031	0.4
Social Security	1,511	3.3	250	1.1	1,519	2.1	3,000	5.4	1,264	5.0	1,170	2.4
Other Sources	1,069	5.4	4,882	59.3	1,339	3.5	500	2.0	717	4.4	1,416	4.1

Note: High income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 16

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM LOW INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PUBLIC TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	$ 698	49.4%	$ 991	62.8%	$ 836	58.3%	$ 780	60.2%	--	--	$ 914	78.4%
SEOG	821	10.5	636	14.8	410	16.1	496	16.8	--	--	788	13.9
State	902	10.8	512	25.8	645	25.9	465	54.1	--	--	850	9.3
Institutional	888	7.6	742	14.4	514	8.4	581	14.8	--	--	1,717	6.8
Private	702	5.6	586	10.9	559	8.2	691	10.4	--	--	861	4.1
Loan												
NDSL	555	2.3	1,069	14.5	469	3.7	728	11.9	--	--5	563	5.2
GSL	714	3.5	1,404	17.0	500	4.1	1,519	14.0	--	--	1,044	7.3
Institutional	483	3.8	842	5.7	1,464	3.2	526	6.3	--	--	1,000	6.1
Other	950	2.6	1,206	9.8	1,107	3.2	1,055	6.0	--	--	1,167	4.0
Work												
Full-Time	989	12.4	897	8.6	750	15.6	764	7.2	--	--	1,750	15.0
Part-Time	502	59.5	437	60.0	489	64.0	470	65.3	--	--	732	28.7
CW-S	521	9.1	469	14.3	300	4.6	577	11.4	--	--	575	17.6
Family												
Parents	586	61.3	784	58.1	823	61.1	843	68.4	--	--	538	45.7
Savings	394	36.7	554	49.2	584	50.0	556	49.1	--	--	582	22.4
Spouse	750	2.6	595	2.1	825	4.6	531	1.1	--	--	512	9.3
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	896	3.1	826	3.4	1,000	5.9	633	4.0	--	--	969	7.0
GI (Student)	1,062	4.0	1,806	3.3	2,321	6.3	2,409	1.5	--	--	914	13.4
Social Security	962	19.6	764	19.4	742	26.4	894	18.4	--	--	841	23.3
Other Sources	583	6.2	844	8.1	737	8.8	583	6.1	--	--	1,283	6.9

Notes: Low income = total annual income less than $12,500.
Blanks (--) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 17

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PUBLIC TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	$ 670	13.3%	$ 532	25.5%	$ 646	14.0%	$ 540	17.6%	—	—	$ 632	24.2%
SEOG	787	3.6	529	6.2	333	2.9	457	2.2	—	—	667	9.0
State	964	3.9	377	20.5	413	5.7	438	24.7	—	—	857	10.4
Institutional	687	2.2	476	7.8	591	5.4	485	5.4	—	—	250	1.5
Private	500	4.5	450	8.2	517	7.0	610	7.2	—	—	0	0
Loan												
NDSL	639	1.6	1,292	13.0	812	2.0	950	7.7	—	—	250	1.5
GSL	800	1.8	1,552	24.4	1,150	3.6	1,667	18.4	—	—	1,200	7.5
Institutional	607	2.6	934	3.6	550	1.2	542	3.0	—	—	0	0
Other	544	3.2	1,390	12.4	1,083	4.4	1,315	8.0	—	—	0	0
Work												
Full-Time	916	15.4	845	10.1	985	16.7	919	6.3	—	—	2,375	9.7
Part-Time	585	75.3	549	71.1	567	77.2	587	76.7	—	—	639	65.2
CW-S	765	3.1	400	9.2	447	5.9	536	8.3	—	—	536	10.6
Family												
Parents	655	76.0	1,149	81.1	1,195	82.6	1,377	85.4	—	—	1,000	81.4
Savings	459	48.9	594	61.6	557	66.8	601	59.8	—	—	718	45.6
Spouse	454	2.1	878	1.7	1,276	4.6	841	0.7	—	—	875	3.2
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	615	2.4	854	1.6	600	1.2	1,470	1.1	—	—	4,000	3.1
GI (Student)	1,375	1.9	1,881	1.7	3,083	2.2	1,583	0.6	—	—	3,625	6.0
Social Security	983	10.5	956	5.2	1,083	6.6	1,020	4.0	—	—	1,583	4.6
Other Sources	723	5.4	805	5.5	1,070	6.3	592	3.7	—	—	0	0

Notes: Middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000.
Blanks (—) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of Californi, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 18

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM HIGH INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PUBLIC TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	$ 781	4.3%	$ 597	9.1%	$ 750	3.6%	$ 727	4.6%	—	—	$ 0	0%
SEOG	1,625	1.1	300	2.1	250	3.6	750	0.4	—	—	0	0
State	3,000	0.5	339	11.6	250	1.8	571	3.1	—	—	750	7.1
Institutional	2,250	1.1	283	3.2	0	0	812	1.7	—	—	0	0
Private	1,333	1.7	770	5.4	250	5.3	531	3.4	—	—	0	0
Loan												
NDSL	1,875	1.1	1,281	3.5	0	0	1,333	1.3	—	—	0	0
GSL	2,250	1.1	1,465	14.9	1,500	1.7	2,196	5.9	—	—	0	0
Institutional	3,000	0.6	1,679	1.5	0	0	1,875	0.9	—	—	0	0
Other	1,750	2.2	1,544	7.3	250	3.5	1,640	6.9	—	—	250	7.7
Work												
Full-Time	885	14.8	1,100	10.9	1,044	29.3	868	7.6	—	—	813	25.0
Part-Time	805	71.6	576	68.7	617	53.3	672	7.3	—	—	350	38.5
CW-S	1,167	1.6	276	4.0	250	3.6	750	0.4	—	—	0	0
Family												
Parents	966	80.9	1,961	91.2	1,631	88.4	2,166	90.3	—	—	1,117	78.9
Savings	592	56.2	772	64.4	622	59.7	784	56.2	—	—	464	46.7
Spouse	1,000	3.4	1,042	1.3	750	1.8	750	0.4	—	—	0	0
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	2,083	1.7	571	1.5	0	0	1,500	0.4	—	—	0	0
GI (Student)	1,937	2.3	1,400	1.1	0	0	1,125	0.9	—	—	750	7.7
Social Security	900	5.6	1,265	3.6	417	5.4	571	3.0	—	—	0	0
Other Sources	708	7.4	989	5.3	250	2.0	1,000	3.1	—	—	250	7.7

Notes: High income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.
Blanks (—) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of Californi, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 19

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM LOW INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	$1,259	66.9%	$1,199	69.6%	$1,270	75.2%	$1,110	64.7%	$1,347	89.8%	$1,293	77.6%
SEOG	950	26.4	838	26.7	851	40.8	616	30.7	861	27.5	692	35.1
State	2,632	67.8	1,075	63.3	1,030	40.3	1,012	57.8	1,418	45.0	645	35.4
Institutional	1,907	67.4	1,501	66.0	1,212	43.1	1,378	58.0	1,139	26.7	1,139	38.2
Private	966	29.9	777	21.3	720	13.9	949	22.2	1,006	13.4	744	25.9
Loan												
NDSL	906	46.7	1,012	37.4	808	33.7	895	30.6	866	16.9	814	37.2
GSL	959	19.9	1,494	29.6	1,755	33.7	1,768	29.5	1,171	10.5	1,140	17.1
Institutional	901	21.0	901	11.4	1,083	23.4	771	12.5	845	10.3	805	14.0
Other	1,381	3.5	1,294	11.3	1,803	8.1	1,404	11.6	625	7.2	1,169	7.8
Work												
Full-Time	801	7.1	814	6.2	992	11.7	726	5.0	839	9.5	701	6.1
Part-Time	531	70.6	491	68.0	762	72.2	512	67.0	430	39.3	493	54.2
CW-S	654	38.2	630	37.6	616	56.6	552	48.1	667	64.9	597	50.4
Family												
Parents	1,264	68.8	1,174	69.3	1,045	66.5	1,215	73.4	763	71.5	1,016	74.1
Savings	485	49.8	565	49.8	571	51.2	559	52.6	480	32.3	485	43.0
Spouse	700	1.1	1,062	0.4	500	1.1	1,500	0.5	857	4.2	1,241	1.5
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	984	2.5	780	2.6	583	2.8	860	3.0	856	7.6	1,104	3.7
GI (Student)	1,678	1.1	791	0.6	3,357	1.3	675	1.2	773	3.3	1,221	1.4
Social Security	865	20.4	992	15.9	905	24.6	995	19.4	630	21.4	763	17.7
Other Sources	1,186	6.2	1,271	8.8	759	5.4	1,135	5.9	545	7.0	914	8.0

Note: Low income = total annual income less than $12,500.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of Californi, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 20

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	$1,280	20.5%	$ 972	26.2%	$1,111	33.2%	$ 927	23.3%	$1,089	32.5%	$ 984	28.6%
SEOG	796	6.5	845	10.8	643	10.9	586	10.5	852	11.9	722	12.4
State	2,611	56.0	659	55.2	734	16.6	896	34.2	1,389	43.6	585	26.9
Institutional	1,678	62.3	1,374	59.2	1,322	41.1	1,479	51.2	1,287	53.4	1,242	41.2
Private	995	28.8	871	17.8	1,027	14.9	971	18.7	1,134	23.9	882	18.3
Loan												
NDSL	922	28.9	1,143	29.7	980	19.7	1,085	23.7	1,105	24.9	1,015	24.1
GSL	1,129	20.0	1,654	33.5	2,063	31.6	1,877	33.5	1,437	10.4	1,523	15.9
Institutional	909	16.9	924	10.2	984	19.8	887	12.5	974	8.3	828	8.4
Other	1,723	4.4	1,536	15.3	1,891	11.4	1,716	12.2	1,470	7.4	1,495	8.2
Work												
Full-Time	1,013	4.6	830	7.8	1,014	10.3	927	5.7	725	4.5	914	5.3
Part-Time	649	78.3	586	76.7	794	81.1	607	77.4	510	57.4	567	65.7
CW-S	695	26.3	536	30.3	543	37.3	541	31.9	679	41.9	624	30.7
Family												
Parents	2,216	91.7	2,100	90.9	2,173	90.3	2,387	92.1	2,066	91.9	2,118	92.3
Savings	712	64.1	680	61.8	740	66.9	682	64.8	730	49.4	685	56.5
Spouse	667	0.2	2,031	0.7	1,109	1.5	1,875	0.5	750	0.4	1,302	1.0
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	1,573	1.3	901	1.3	1,091	2.1	1,221	1.2	643	3.0	1,606	2.2
GI (Student)	2,083	0.2	1,750	0.3	1,937	0.7	2,604	0.5	250	0.4	2,500	1.0
Social Security	1,112	7.3	1,054	6.2	1,243	7.1	1,156	5.1	717	6.5	1,149	6.2
Other Sources	1,618	5.8	1,468	7.2	1,333	6.1	1,411	4.8	1,329	9.9	1,172	6.6

Note: Middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of Californi, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 21

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM HIGH INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	$1,410	4.7%	$1,052	7.0%	$ 987	7.1%	$1,173	3.5%	$1,562	9.0%	$ 984	9.6%
SEOG	937	1.0	1,221	1.4	1,150	0.9	958	0.8	875	1.1	986	2.0
State	1,961	6.8	372	29.3	933	2.9	1,033	2.6	906	4.5	517	15.8
Institutional	1,528	20.4	1,205	17.9	934	15.2	1,417	10.7	1,351	24.0	1,167	19.3
Private	1,016	18.4	1,151	7.9	914	6.1	1,090	8.2	1,375	9.9	1,027	8.7
Loan												
NDSL	1,250	3.5	1,204	4.5	911	2.7	1,398	4.5	750	4.0	1,041	3.3
GSL	1,521	9.3	1,824	15.5	2,121	6.7	2,063	11.3	1,417	3.3	1,682	5.8
Institutional	1,496	5.0	1,121	2.9	1,000	3.1	1,102	3.0	500	3.4	1,000	1.7
Other	2,034	3.3	1,890	7.0	1,896	4.6	2,229	6.4	1,450	2.8	1,742	3.2
Work												
Full-Time	1,308	3.4	1,033	5.1	989	4.5	1,025	3.4	1,000	2.3	950	3.3
Part-Time	758	68.9	608	65.2	662	68.6	613	71.6	571	56.2	598	60.7
CW-S	767	6.3	700	4.5	617	5.7	527	5.5	437	4.5	603	6.2
Family												
Parents	4,244	97.4	4,020	96.5	4,224	96.5	4,202	97.8	4,070	97.6	3,702	97.0
Savings	847	58.0	786	52.5	741	54.8	723	58.0	651	42.6	729	51.5
Spouse	1,500	0.4	1,300	0.4	1,562	0.8	2,000	0.3	0	0	2,075	0.5
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	1,000	0.6	1,906	0.7	833	0.6	1,458	0.4	0	0	1,474	1.0
GI (Student)	3,250	0.1	5,000	0.1	3,417	0.6	250	0.1	0	0	1,708	0.3
Social Security	1,284	3.2	1,467	3.2	2,750	2.1	1,234	2.2	875	1.1	958	2.8
Other Sources	2,072	3.4	2,100	4.5	1,672	3.2	1,924	4.4	1,875	2.3	1,628	5.3

Note: High income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of Californi, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 22

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM LOW INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PRIVATE TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	--	--	$1,147	79.0%	--	--	--	--	$1,215	70.2%	$1,136	76.0%
SEOG	--	--	791	30.2	--	--	--	--	673	26.5	574	23.5
State	--	--	1,126	42.6	--	--	--	--	1,055	60.2	443	50.1
Institutional	--	--	662	39.6	--	--	--	--	602	24.2	582	32.2
Private	--	--	750	12.6	--	--	--	--	558	14.4	652	15.5
Loan												
NDSL	--	--	1,314	17.6	--	--	--	--	432	11.4	640	21.3
GSL	--	--	1,447	30.4	--	--	--	--	550	5.4	799	14.3
Institutional	--	--	768	9.6	--	--	--	--	625	12.8	694	12.7
Other	--	--	1,234	10.7	--	--	--	--	700	5.5	1,300	6.7
Work												
Full-Time	--	--	727	7.5	--	--	--	--	1,125	6.6	591	11.4
Part-Time	--	--	430	57.0	--	--	--	--	351	47.9	451	55.0
CW-S	--	--	538	45.3	--	--	--	--	508	29.4	529	47.5
Family												
Parents	--	--	875	58.9	--	--	--	--	1,000	82.5	911	72.1
Savings	--	--	436	45.2	--	--	--	--	676	36.5	472	42.3
Spouse	--	--	416	1.9	--	--	--	--	542	6.4	987	5.0
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	--	--	1,500	4.5	--	--	--	--	625	4.1	1,240	6.1
GI (Student)	--	--	1,833	3.8	--	--	--	--	417	3.2	1,200	3.8
Social Security	--	--	714	25.9	--	--	--	--	524	21.2	815	18.1
Other Sources	--	--	1,550	13.4	--	--	--	--	500	5.5	563	0.8

Notes: Low income = total annual income less than $12,500.
Blanks (--) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of Californi, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 23

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM MIDDLE INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PRIVATE TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	--	--	$ 959	38.1%	--	--	--	--	$1,109	29.8%	$ 777	33.6%
SEOG	--	--	666	18.2	--	--	--	--	1,091	7.2	500	9.3
State	--	--	892	34.5	--	--	--	--	1,217	40.1	443	39.3
Institutional	--	--	798	37.0	--	--	--	--	770	22.8	594	30.3
Private	--	--	732	9.8	--	--	--	--	712	13.0	609	15.0
Loan												
NDSL	--	--	1,484	22.4	--	--	--	--	562	5.2	829	14.3
GSL	--	--	1,572	37.1	--	--	--	--	571	4.6	1,018	12.8
Institutional	--	--	795	8.0	--	--	--	--	750	7.8	820	7.6
Other	--	--	1,573	12.2	--	--	--	--	821	4.6	1,500	10.0
Work												
Full-Time	--	--	575	6.8	--	--	--	--	500	5.3	770	8.7
Part-Time	--	--	473	61.8	--	--	--	--	558	54.5	535	59.0
CW-S	--	--	580	36.8	--	--	--	--	450	6.5	485	28.3
Family												
Parents	--	--	1,642	81.7	--	--	--	--	1,640	93.1	1,726	90.1
Savings	--	--	561	55.5	--	--	--	--	593	37.6	634	51.4
Spouse	--	--	350	3.5	--	--	--	--	1,875	1.4	1,438	1.9
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	--	--	1,875	2.8	--	--	--	--	875	1.3	929	3.3
GI (Student)	--	--	250	0.7	--	--	--	--	0	0	1,167	0.7
Social Security	--	--	250	2.1	--	--	--	--	1,964	4.6	613	7.2
Other Sources	--	--	805	6.6	--	--	--	--	1,273	7.5	1,083	4.3

Notes: Middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000.
Blanks (--) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE 24

AVERAGE AMOUNT RECEIVED PER RECIPIENT (Amount)
AND RECIPIENTS AS A PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS (Percent)
FOR ALL SOURCES OF FUNDING: STUDENTS FROM HIGH INCOME FAMILIES
ATTENDING PRIVATE TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-1978

Source of Funding	State											
	California		New York		Ohio		Pennsylvania		South Carolina		Conglomerate[a]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Grant												
BEOG	—	—	$1,350	17.2%	—	—	—	—	$ 417	7.9%	$ 902	17.0%
SEOG	—	—	750	3.8	—	—	—	—	250	2.6	950	3.3
State	—	—	3,000	4.2	—	—	—	—	500	12.8	379	21.5
Institutional	—	—	833	11.5	—	—	—	—	2,250	5.3	738	13.4
Private	—	—	375	16.7	—	—	—	—	687	10.5	482	9.2
Loan												
NDSL	—	—	2,000	12.0	—	—	—	—	0	0	375	2.6
GSL	—	—	2,250	24.0	—	—	—	—	750	2.6	885	8.3
Institutional	—	—	750	4.3	—	—	—	—	250	2.6	688	2.6
Other	—	—	2,750	16.7	—	—	—	—	750	2.6	2,000	3.3
Work												
Full-Time	—	—	1,000	22.7	—	—	—	—	250	2.6	1,125	5.4
Part-Time	—	—	673	46.4	—	—	—	—	554	52.2	635	52.0
CW-S	—	—	791	22.2	—	—	—	—	750	7.7	484	10.3
Family												
Parents	—	—	3,657	79.5	—	—	—	—	2,815	90.6	2,839	92.1
Savings	—	—	1,383	51.7	—	—	—	—	656	39.0	731	53.4
Spouse	—	—	1,500	4.8	—	—	—	—	250	5.1	1,150	3.3
Other Federal Benefits												
GI (Parents)	—	—	0	0	—	—	—	—	750	2.6	1,333	2.0
GI (Student)	—	—	0	0	—	—	—	—	0	0	2,625	1.3
Social Security	—	—	1,583	15.0	—	—	—	—	583	7.5	518	8.9
Other Sources	—	—	5,000	5.3	—	—	—	—	750	2.6	833	7.9

Notes: High income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.
Blanks (—) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of Californi, Los Angeles. Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

Public Four-Year Institutions

Grant programs. Looking at public four-year institutions, it is clear that among grant programs, there is a larger variation among the states for state grants than there is for any other source of grants. This is true across all levels of income.

For low-income students, state grants are distributed to between 10 and 60 percent of all students, with the average award varying between $500 and $950. BEOG funds are distributed to between 60 and 80 percent of the students and while the average award among recipients is higher than that of state grants, the range across the states is lower. SEOG funds are received by between 25 and 35 percent of the low-income students with the exception of Pennsylvania, although the magnitude of the average award varies across states to the same extent as state grants. Institutional and private grants are received by between 10 and 30 percent of all low-income students and the average award is between $700 and $900, with the exception of Pennsylvania where average awards are substantially lower.

For middle-income students, state grants are received by between 5 and 40 percent of all students while BEOG and SEOG awards are made to between 10 and 18 percent and between 3 and 6 percent of the students, respectively, with the exception of New York. Institutional and private grants to middle-income students are made to between 5 and 15 percent of all students, except in California where over 20 percent of all students receive such awards. Generally, the magnitudes of all

grant awards to middle-income students are lower than those made to low-income students, with less interstate variation in such magnitudes. The exception to this finding is that in Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina and the conglomerate, institutional grants to middle-income students exceed those to low-income students by between $50 and $330.

For high-income students, the proportion of students receiving grants declines and the interstate variation in the chance of receiving grants from any of the programs is reduced, with a few notable exceptions. For state grants and the BEOG program, high-income students attending public four-year institutions in New York have a much greater chance than similar students in other states of receiving an award. High-income students in California have a much greater chance of receiving grants from private sources compared to high-income students in other states. While the chances of receiving grants from any of the sources decreases for high-income students, the interstate variation in the magnitude of such grants increases, compared to that found for low- or middle-income students attending public four-year institutions. Interstate variations of $500 to $1,000 in average grants exist for high-income students among all programs.

Loan programs. Loans from individual programs to students attending public four-year institutions do not vary as widely as grants, either in the probability of receiving one or in the magnitude of the average loan received. For low-income students, there is less interstate variation in the chance of receiving a loan for the NDSL program compared to the GSL program although the finding is reversed

for the magnitude of the average award. Institutional and other loans are received by small proportions of students although the average awards received are high. As a rule, GSL loans are higher than NDSL loans and other loans are higher than institutional loans for low-income students. Interstate variations in the chance of receiving a loan from the NDSL or GSL program increase for middle-income students, compared to low-income students although average awards are similar across states for each program and higher for GSL loans compared to NDSL loans. Generally, the chances of receiving an institutional loan decrease and the chance of receiving some other loan increase for middle-income students compared to low-income students; a similar pattern is found for the average loan awarded. In general, a very small proportion of high-income students receive loans from any of the loan programs, although over 10 percent of the high-income students attending public four-year institutions in New York and Pennsylvania receive loans. Wide variations in the magnitude of the average loan exist within all programs for high income students.

Work, family and other federal benefits. Few students attending public four-year institutions work on a full-time basis in any income group. Generally between 5 and 10 percent of the students work full time and earnings are between $800 and $1,100 for those that do. These figures may reflect the amount earned from full-time work for a short period of time or that portion of full-time earnings that are actually used in support of education costs. There is much greater interstate variation in the chance of working on a part-time basis, particularly for low-income students, although the average amount earned from

part-time work is similar across the states, between $450 and $600. Larger interstate variations exist in the proportions of students participating in the CW-S program, particularly among low-income students. Interstate variations in the amount of support provided by the CW-S program are large, about $400 for all income groups.

As expected, the proportion of students receiving support and the amount of support received from parents increases as income increases. In addition, there are slight variations among the states in the proportions and amounts, particularly for low-income students. The range of average parental support to students is $500 across all income groups. However, since the average parental contribution increases substantially as income increases, the range in interstate variation as a proportion of the mean parental support decreases as income increases. Generally, support derived from students' savings is between $400 and $700, increasing slightly with income, and with little variation in the proportion of students providing such funds across states. Students' spouses provide significant levels of support to a very small proportion of students and little can be said about interstate variations in such support.

Among other federal benefits, social security funds are provided to between 15 and 22 percent of all low-income students and to between 3 and 7 percent of all middle-income students. Social security benefits to high-income students and G.I. Bill benefits to all students provide support to less than 5 percent of all students. Such funds are

significant, generally between $500 and $1,500, for those receiving any support.

Public Two-Year Institutions

Grant programs. As is found for public four-year institutions, there is greater variability among the states for state grants compared to other grant programs. Between 10 and 50 percent of low-income students attending public two-year institutions receive state grants while between 50 and 78 percent of such students receive BEOG funds and between 10 and 17 percent of such students receive SEOG funds. Between 5 and 15 percent of all low-income students receive institutional or private grants. With the exception of private grants, there is a similar amount of interstate variation in the amount of grant aid received by low-income students from any of the programs. While the proportion of middle-income students receiving grants and the magnitude of grants generally decrease in comparison to similar figures for low-income students, the magnitude of state grant award increases in California and the conglomerate and declines only slightly in Pennsylvania. While the variation in the average amount received from state grants, SEOG funds and institutional grants remains high for middle-income students, such variation is small for BEOG and private grants. The states also vary across income groups in the proportion of individuals receiving state grants. In New York, 26 percent of low-income students, 21 percent of middle-income students and 12 percent of high-income students receive a state grant. In Pennsylvania, 54 percent of low-income students, 25 percent of

middle-income students and 3 percent of high-income students receive a state grant. Among low-income students, the proportion of students receiving grants from any program is generally low but the average amount received varies considerably among states.

Loan Programs. Loans are generally received by less than 15 percent of all students in public two-year institutions, leading to small interstate variations in the proportion of students receiving such aid for each of the programs. Compared to students in the other states, students in New York and Pennsylvania have a higher chance of receiving a loan through the GSL or NDSL programs. As was shown previously, the average loan made through the GSL program exceeds the average loan made through the NDSL program, while the average loan made through private sources generally exceeds the average loan made by institutions. Other loans provide notable support to nearly 10 percent of the students in New York and Pennsylvania, but in other states, while the support is relatively high, the number of recipients is very low.

Work, family and other federal benefits. The proportion of students working full-time at public two-year institutions exceeds such proportions for students attending public four-year institutions. Concomitantly there is greater interstate variation in the proportion of students working on a full-time basis. Generally, as income increases the average earnings from full-time work increase although it is not known whether such an increase is due to average wage or numbers of hours worked. The proportion of students reporting earnings from

part-time work is more constant across states, with the notable exceptions of low-income students in the conglomerate and high-income students in Pennsylvania and the conglomerate, where participation is much lower than average. Generally, the amounts earned from part-time work are similar across states and income groups. Variations in the proportion of students participating in the CW-S program exist for low-income students but are negligible for middle- and high-income students. The average amount earned from participation in a CW-S program varies to only a small extent among states and primarily among high-income students.

Very little interstate variation exists for support provided by parents. Between 45 and 68 percent of all low-income students receive aid from their parents of between $550 and $850. Between 75 and 85 percent of middle-income students receive such support, which is between $1,000 and $1,400, with the exception of California, where the average amount received is less than $700. Between 80 and 90 percent of all high-income students receive a parental contribution although it varies from under $1,000 to over $2,000 in magnitude. The proportion of students providing support from savings increase with income while interstate variations in such proportions decrease as income increases. Generally, students provide between $500 and $800 from savings. Spouses provide support to only a small proportion of students.

The pattern of support for other federal benefits to students attending public two-year institutions is similar to the pattern found for students attending public four-year institutions.

Private Four-Year Institutions

As can be expected, the patterns of aid distribution for students attending private institutions are somewhat different from those attending public institutions. That is, the actual proportions of students receiving aid from particular programs and the magnitude of that aid are different for students attending private institutions in comparison to public institutions. However, the patterns previously found for interstate variations in those figures generally are similar for public and private institutions.

Grant programs. As has been shown earlier, state grants are distributed in a more diversified way among the states than those received from any other grant program. Between 35 and 68 percent of all low-income students received such grants, which vary from less than $700 to over $2,600 in average amount. Among three states that have similar award levels of just over $1,000 in state grants, the variation in the probability of receiving one is between 40 and 63 percent. In contrast, BEOG awards are received by between 65 and 90 percent of all low-income students and the average award is between $1,100 and $1,350. The SEOG program provides awards of between $600 and $950 to between 26 and 40 percent of the low-income students. Institutional grants are received by between 27 and 67 percent of low-income students but the average award only varies between $1,100 and $1,900. Private grants are between $700 and $1,000 in value but are received by between 13 and 30 percent of the students.

A similar pattern exists for middle-income students. Between 16 and 56 percent of such students receive state grants, which vary in magnitude from $600 to $2,600. BEOG awards are distributed to between 20 and 33 percent of middle-income students and the average award is between $900 and $1,300. Approximately 11 percent of middle-income students receive SEOG awards of between $580 and $850. Between 41 and 62 percent of middle-income students receive institutional grants, ranging from $1,200 to $1,700. Between 15 and 29 percent of middle-income students receive grants from private sources and these are between $850 and $1,150 in magnitude.

A much smaller proportion of high-income students receive grants in any form, although for those that do, the variation in the value of state grants, $1,600, exceeds the average value of a grant receive from other sources. Institutional grants provide a significant source of support to between 10 and 25 percent of low-income students.

Loan programs. Continuing a pattern found previously, the magnitude of GSL loans exceeds that of NDSL loans while other loans exceed institutional loans across all income groups. The GSL program varies widely across the states at all income levels in terms of both the proportion of students receiving loans and the average loan. With some exceptions, the average loan receive from NDSL, institutional and other sources are similar within income groups, increasing to some extent as income increases, primarily between the middle- and high-income groups.

Work, family, and other federal benefits. Only a small proportion of students work on a full-time basis, with the proportion declining as income increases while the amount earned increases with family income level. The earnings from part-time work are similar across states and income groups. A smaller proportion of all students work on a part-time basis in South Carolina and the conglomerate. Variations in the amount earned through participation in CW-S programs is negligible although the proportion of students participating varies widely, particularly for low-income students.

The parental contribution pattern is very similar across the states within income groups. About 70 percent of all low-income students receive aid from their parents of between $1,000 and $1,250. Low-income students in South Carolina only receive $750, on average, from their parents. About 90 percent of all middle-income students receive aid from their parents and such aid varies from $2,000 to $2,400. Over 95 percent of all high-income students received a parental contribution of between $3,700 and $4,250. A large proportion of students provide funds from their savings to attend private four-year institutions. Nearly 50 percent of all low-income student provide approximately $500, while around 65 percent of all middle-income students provide approximately $700 and between 50 and 60 percent of high-income students provide between $650 and $850. There is almost no contribution from students' spouses.

The pattern for other federal benefits is similar to that found in the public sector. Social security benefits are large to around 20

percent of low-income students, dropping to 6 percent of middle-income students and 3 percent of high-income students. G.I. Bill benefits are significant to the very small proportion of students who receive them.

Private Two-Year Institutions

Most of the patterns that have been shown to exist previously are found in the private two-year sector, despite the fact that data are available for only three states. For grants, state grants appear to vary more widely in proportion of students receiving them and in average amount than other programs. For loans, GSL varies more widely than other loan programs in terms of the proportion of students who receive loans from the program. Loans from the GSL program are of higher value than those from the NDSL program, while other loans exceed institutional loans in value. Funds receive from part-time and full-time work are similar across states and while CW-S funds are similar across states, the proportion of students participating in the program varies among states. Contributions from family and benefits received through other federal programs follow patterns established in the other sectors.

In conclusion, it appears that the patterns of distribution for the 18 individual sources examined are more similar across states than might be expected, particularly for the BEOG program, part-time work and parental contribution. Differences in these sources across income groups and institutional sectors are in directions that can be predicted. Other programs, and particularly the state grant,

institutional grant, NDSL and GSL programs vary widely across states, institutional sectors and income groups. Most of these programs provide large levels of benefits to their recipients and, in concert with all other sources, combine to reduce the price of college attendance significantly. It is clear that the large interstate variations in the way some of these programs operate are likely to lead to differences in the prices paid by individuals of similar incomes to attend similar institutions in different states. It is not possible, however, using the data presented in the tables in this booklet, to examine the combined impact of these programs for individuals, which is necessary in order to understand the true impact of the programs on their recipients. Nevertheless, it is clear that, given the amount of funds provided by state and institutional programs and the differences that exist across the states both in the way such funds are distributed and in the costs of attendance, the partnership that currently exists among federal, state and institutional programs results in differential effects on students in the states.

V. EXPECTED AND ACTUAL PARENTAL SUPPORT TO STUDENTS

One of the most controversial problems that arises in examining the provision of postsecondary education support is the determination of the appropriate contribution that families, specifically parents, ought to make. It is rarely disputed that parents should, in fact, provide some support for dependent children. Determining an equitable level of such support, given widely varying circumstances in the number of children in a family, family income and assets, the relationship between the student and his family, and other similar family matters, it is not unexpected that there is not a great deal of uniformity in the level of support that is actually provided by parents. Two basic analytic systems currently exist by which parental contribution is evaluated.

First, under the federal Basic Grant program, parental financial circumstances are analyzed in determining the size of the award for which a student is eligible. The Basic Grant program also takes into consideration the student's cost of attendance in actually distributing awards to students. This system establishes a uniform rate of expected parental contribution based on the calculated disposable income of the family. Changing the rate has implications for program eligibility and award magnitude.

The second system for assessing family ability to pay is the uniform methodology, designed to consider a myriad of factors related to the financial circumstances of the family and to calculate an equitable

expected parental contribution. This system does not take into consideration the cost of attendance, but rather determines what level of parental support should be expected given the income, assets, family size and special financial circumstances of a particular family. It is rare that the amount of need-based student financial aid distributed is sufficient in magnitude to make up the difference between what it actually costs to attend an institution and what a family with a low ability to pay is expected to contribute. By the same token, families may be expected to contribute more under this system than they actually do provide in support. The system is used extensively to rank students in terms of their ability to pay or their need so that the distribution of funds from numerous financial aid sources can be used to meet such needs in an equitable, if not completely adequate manner.

One of the concerns that has arisen in the last few years, and particularly in the debate over the federal role in providing support for postsecondary education, is that certain families are being required to bear an inequitable burden in providing support. These families, usually described as middle-income families, generally are believed to have benefited least in a postsecondary education system in which the costs of attendance have risen rapidly while available student aid funds have been targeted to relatively low-income families. While the high-income family is viewed as being able to bear the burden of these higher costs and the low-income family is relieved of the burden due to increases in state and federal student financial aid, the middle-income family is viewed as being caught in the "middle", neither able to reasonably bear the burden of increased costs nor eligible to

receive government provided aid.

Conflicting information exists to document this impression. On the one hand, it is claimed that the costs of college attendance are about the same proportion of the average income as they have been historically. On the other hand, it is claimed that enrollments are declining among students from middle-income families, reflecting the fact that such families can no longer provide the necessary support to permit college attendance. Both of these arguments can be disputed given the lack of precise data to evaluate either one.

One way to measure the extent of the current burden of providing educational support on parents is to assess the degree to which the amount parents are actually providing is different from the amount that they are expected to provide under the requirements of an assessment procedure such as the uniform methodology. It is generally expected that some families are providing more, and others less, than they are expected to provide and that differences in the extent of over- or underprovision may be systematically related to location, family income or type of institution a student attends.

Rather than discussing an under- or overprovision of parental contribution, it is typical to examine the unmet or overmet need of students. A number of different definitions exist for unmet or overmet need, making it confusing to use the term without defining it precisely. In general, unmet need has been calculated in aggregate for institutions or states in order to indicate the need for additional

supplies of student aid funds. Under these circumstances, need may be defined as the difference between what it costs to attend an institution and the level of aid received from all sources, including parents.

In this calculation, the actual parental contribution is used. However, parents may be making contributions above or below the level suggested by the uniform methodology. What is needed is an analysis of the extent to which parents are paying more than or less than they are expected to pay. In fact, unmet need can be defined as the difference between what parents are expected to pay and what they actually pay. This definition easily can be coordinated with the earlier definition of net price. Net price has been defined as the difference between the cost of attendance and the amount of student aid received. That is,

net price = cost of attendance - student aid

Net price is, of course, the actual family contribution to education.

The actual family contribution can be split into that portion that is expected to be paid and that portion that is paid in addition to or below the expected portion, or need. That is,

actual family contribution + need = expected family contribution

or, rearranging terms

actual family contribution - need = expected family contribution.

When need is positive, it indicates that more financial support could have been used to reduce the actual family contribution to the level of the expected family contribution. That is, a positive need is indicative of unmet need. If, however, need is negative, it indicates that the actual family contribution should have been higher. In the case of overmet need, there are two ways to increase the actual family contribution: First, by reducing student aid support and second by increasing the cost of attendance, primarily the tuition component. In other words, overmet need or negative need, indicates that tuition was too low and/or student aid was too high. Of course, at certain income levels, the expected parental contribution is likely to exceed even the full cost of attendance with the result that the actual parental contribution remains below the expected parental contribution.

Using the equations defined above, then, need is calculated by subtracting the expected family contribution from the actual family contribution.

For the purposes of this paper, need is conceived in terms of the parental contribution only and is defined as the difference between what parents actually contribute and what they are expected to contribute. This definition will misrepresent actual need, since no evaluation of the student contribution is included. However, since expected and actual student contributions tend to be low, and are generally similar, the definition of need in terms of parental contribution is likely to be fairly accurate.

The average overmet or unmet need of students, by state, income group and institutional sector, is shown in Table 25.* Expected parental contribution has been determined using College Scholarship Service figures for a family of four. The average is calculated by finding the numerical mean of those figures for students in particular groups. The most obvious pattern to emerge is that all students from low-income families have some unmet need. The availability of between $200 and $800 of additional student aid per student would be required in order to reduce the actual parental contribution of low-income families to the expected level. Despite the higher cost of attendance, it appears that the unmet need of low-income students attending private institutions is not that much higher than the unmet need of low-income students attending public institutions. Of course, in the aggregate, the amount of funds necessary to eliminate the unmet needs of all families will be large.

*Appendix B contains similar data for the United States.

For middle-income families, the parental contribution made to students attending public institutions is much less than is expected. In California, for instance, families provide $1,000 to $1,500 less than they are expected to provide. In large part, this phenomenon in California and the other states is probably due to the relatively low tuition levels established for public institutions. In a simplistic sense, the amount of funds needed to pay for the unmet needs of low-income students can come from additional charges, by raising tuition, to middle-income or, perhaps more appropriately, to high-income students. It is clear that high-income parents can pay a

TABLE 25

AMOUNT OF UNMET (+) OR OVERMET (-) NEED
FOR AVERAGE STUDENT'S PARENT CONTRIBUTION:
BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE BY FAMILY INCOME GROUP FOR SIX STATES IN 1977-78

Institutional Type and Family Income Group[a]	State					
	California	New York	Ohio	Pennsylvania	South Carolina	Conglomerate[b]
Public Four-Year						
Low Income	$ +429[c]	$ +299	$ +716	$ +530	$ +479	$ +529
Middle Income	-1,023	-784	-476	-461	-599	-519
High Income	-4,112	-4,032	-3,785	-4,150	-4,301	-3,805
Public Two-Year						
Low Income	+271	+351	+378	+448	---	+201
Middle Income	-1,535	-944	-844	-687	---	-1,193
High Income	-5,656	-4,567	-4,798	-4,326	---	-5,523
Private Four-Year						
Low Income	+753	+704	+597	+765	+496	+653
Middle Income	-187	-232	-113	+47	-187	-115
High Income	-2,660	-2,813	-2,624	-2,586	-2,746	-3,126
Private Two-Year						
Low Income	---	+428	---	---	+712	+560
Middle Income	---	-499	---	---	-378	-434
High Income	---	-3,462	---	---	-3,920	-3,955

Note: Blanks (---) denote categories for which sufficient data were not available.

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

[b]Pooled data for the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Virginia.

[c]Unmet or overmet need is defined as the difference between what parents are actually contributing and what parents are expected to contribute.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles.
Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

great deal more, across all states and all sectors, than they are providing. What is not known is what the effects of imposing significantly higher charges on high-income or middle-income families would be in terms of the enrollment behavior of students, including the choice to attend school at all or the choice to select a different institution. Also, some portion of the funds that reduce the amount of support that parents need to provide is distributed in the form of loans, as has been shown previously, which must be paid back in the future rather than being paid out of current income.

The institutions in which middle-income families appear to be under the most pressure are those in the private four-year sector. While in most states, families can provide more funds than they actually do provide, the average amount of the overmet need is low. In Pennsylvania, families are providing slightly more than they are expected to provide in the form of parental contribution. For the middle-income group, some of the funds that reduce the parental contribution to its actual level are distributed in the form of loans which must be paid back. With the burden on parents at about the expected level and a future burden on students of significant magnitude, it is apparent that this group is in a precarious position, perhaps even slightly more so than that of low-income students for whom the amount of need in current terms is relatively high, but the future requirements to repay current loans are somewhat lower than is the case for middle-income students.

It should be noted that despite the fact that low-income parents have unmet needs and that middle-income students, and others, may face future burdens due to current loans, students are, in fact, enrolled in institutions. That is, the level of current sacrifice of parents or the level of future sacrifice for students is not so large as to prohibit some students from enrolling. However, the need figures, taken into consideration with the data presented earlier, are indicators of inefficiencies and inequities in the current support system for postsecondary education.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this paper was to examine how funds flow to students in support of their postsecondary education costs. A primary hypothesis was that differences in funding patterns would exist among states, controlling for the family incomes of students and the types of institutions attended. In addition, it was expected that differences in the pattern of funding would be related to family income group and type of institution within states.

A number of questions, such as the following, were raised in order to analyze these differences in support patterns. What are the differences in the costs of attendance? What are the differences in net price, the actual amount paid after deducting student financial aid receipts? What are the probabilities of receiving aid and what are the amounts received from categories of sources, including grants, loans, work and so on? What are the probabilities of receiving aid and what are the amounts received from individual sources of support, including the BEOG program, the NDSL program, part-time work and so on? To what extent are parents providing more or less funds than they are expected to provide in support of students?

In answering these questions, data for individual students were aggregated in several different ways. First, average amounts received from categories of sources were calculated for students of three different income groups, within four types of institutions, for five states and a conglomerate state. Second, average amounts received were

calculated only for recipients for both categories of sources and individual sources. Third, the difference between the expected and the actual parental contribution was calculated for individual students and averages were calculated for groups of students.

Costs of attendance were shown to vary substantially within institutional sectors across states. There was greater interstate variation for public four-year institutions than for any other sector. Also, the costs of attendance differed within sectors by income group. In half of the cases, costs of attendance increased as income increased. On average, grants were the largest source in meeting the cost of attendance for low- and middle-income students attending public institutions. For high-income students attending public institutions and for all students attending private institutions, family sources provided the majority of support. For these sources and most other sources of support, however, wide variations existed among states in the proportion of the total costs of attendance provided by these sources. The total cost of attendance was reduced substantially by student aid funds, and the variation in the net price paid by student's families was smaller than the variation in the cost of attendance among states. Variations in net price were smaller among the states for private institutions in contrast to public institutions. There was a greater decrease for high-income students than low-income students, in interstate variation from cost of attendance to net price.

The patterns of support for recipients of funds indicate that differences were primarily related to income and to whether the

institution attended was public or private, rather than geographical location. Grant funds were received by fewer students and in smaller amounts as income increased while the opposite was generally true for loans. Student work was rather constant across the states in terms of both amount earned and proportion of students participating. Interstate variations became more apparent when individual programs within funding categories were examined. State grants varied widely among states, controlling for income group and institutional sector. It is notable that the BEOG program distributed funds consistently across states. The SEOG program, however, appears to have operated differentially across states and not necessarily in a manner that would have offset the differences found in state grant programs. Less interstate variability was found for loan programs than for grant programs. Among all other sources of support, perhaps the most notable interstate variations were found for the CW-S program, particularly among low-income students.

It has been shown that there are consistent patterns across states in terms of the relationship between what parents were expected to pay and how much support was provided to students. All students from low-income families were providing between $200 and $800 more than they were expected to provide; that is they had significant levels of unmet needs. All high-income parents were providing less than they were expected to provide in support, reflecting the fact that in most cases tuition costs were reduced significantly below actual instructional costs. For many high-income parents the amount they were expected to contribute exceeded the full cost of attendance, however. For

middle-income students, the findings were mixed: those students attending public institutions had overmet needs while the parents of those students attending private institutions were providing about what they ought to have been providing in support.

These findings suggest that variations do exist between the states in the effect of student financial aid programs. Differences in funding patterns between income groups and institutional sectors are essentially in expected directions. Some federal programs distribute funds similarly across states while others do not. It is not obvious that differences are designed to consider differences in state support provided through institutional subsidy or student financial aid. Clearly, more work needs to be completed in order to determine how individual student aid programs interact with one another or whether the system, in its entirety, is equitable.

APPENDIX A

The seriousness of any particular shortcoming of a data base depends upon the purpose for which the data are used. There are three sources of error that could give biased results in this report. First, participation in the CIRP survey is voluntary. Institutions may choose or not choose to participate, and, within each participating institution, the percentage of students completing the student information form varies. The participating institutions may not represent the institutional sector of which they are members, and participating students may not represent the student body to which they belong. The latter situation is alleviated by using only those institutions in which the percentage of students participating in an institution meets the criterion set by CIRP for inclusion in the national norm sample.* How representative institutions are of their sectors is not clear. There could be large differences. Several sectors with many institutions were represented by only a few institutions. Of course, this sparsity of institutions in the sample was not by choice. In fact, selected states were those that had larger numbers of participating institutions in the various sectors than states that were not selected.

---

*Four-year colleges are included in the national norms if over 85 percent of their first-time, full-time freshmen complete the student information form; universities, if over 75 percent; and two-year institutions, if over 50 percent (CIRP, 1977, p. 2).

A second source of bias is that the information is self-reported. The seriousness of this bias undoubtedly varies from funding source to

funding source. For example, on the important question asking the student to estimate his or her parents' annual income, there is likely to be considerable error. Elsewhere, it has been shown that students are not very accurate in estimating their parents' income. The error, however, is systematic. Students of low-income families tend to overestimate their parents' income, and students of high-income families tend to underestimate their parents' income. Given this tendency among students to report incomes closer to the mean than they actually are, comparisons made among the three income categories -- high, middle, and low -- used in this report, understate the actual differences. Information obtained from institutional financial aid officers' files of individual students would be a preferable source of data because the information is more accurate. While much of the reporting of the information is by the student, it is subject to perjury and scrutiny of the financial aid officer. Unfortunately, at this time, no such data base exists.*

*The National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities (NIICU) and the Education Finance Center at ECS are planning to create this type of data base by early 1979.

A third source of bias is in the discrete set of answers from which a respondent must choose. For example, for all of the questions about sources of funding, the respondent must choose among six options: no award, $1 to $499; $500 to $999; $1,000 to $1,999; $2,000 to $4,000; and over $4,000 (CIRP, 1977, p. 128). Calculating means from midpoints is a questionable practice (but one that was done in this report).

Data for analysis of budgets and income groups came from information reported in questions 17 and 29 of the 1977 Student Information Form. The two questions are duplicated below.

17. How much of your first year's educational expenses (room, board, tuition, and fees) do you expect to cover from <u>each</u> of the sources listed below?

(Mark <u>one</u> answer for <u>each</u> possible source)

	NONE	$1-$499	$500-$999	$1,000-$1,999	$2,000-$4,000	OVER $4,000
Parental or Family Aid, or Gifts						
GRANTS OR SCHOLARSHIPS: Basic Educational Opportunity Grant						
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant						
College Work-Study Grant						
State Scholarship or Grant						
College Grant (other than above)						
Other Private Grant						
LOANS: Federal Guaranteed Student Loan						
National Direct Student Loan						
Loan From the College						
Other Loan						
Full-Time Work						
Part-Time or Summer Work (other than above)						
Savings						
Spouse						
Your G.I. Benefits						
Your Parent's G.I. Benefits						
Social Security Department's Benefits						
Other						

29. What is your best estimate of your parent's total income last year? Consider annual income from all sources before taxes.

(Mark one)

Less than $3,000	▱	$15,000 — 19,999	▱
$3,000 — 3,999	▱	$20,000 — 24,999	▱
$4,000 — 5,999	▱	$25,000 — 29,999	▱
$6,000 — 7,999	▱	$30,000 — 34,999	▱
$8,000 — 9,999	▱	$35,000 — 39,999	▱
$10,000 — 12,499	▱	$40,000 — 49,999	▱
$12,500 — 14,999	▱	$50,000 or more	▱

The purpose of emphasizing these shortcomings is twofold. For the readers unfamiliar with the way in which the CIRP data are obtained, it is to warn them not to place much confidence in the specific figures. For the informed readers it is to let them know that the authors of this report are aware of these shortcomings, but that they believe that this data base serves as a useful vehicle for discussing a number of issues and for pointing out areas requiring greater attention by researchers. Furthermore, the purpose is to identify variations in general that occur in the composition of a student's budget rather than to discuss the amounts of specific differences among states, sectors or students.

APPENDIX B

This appendix contains estimates for the United States of the average student budget, net price and net price as a percentage of the average budget, and the amount of unmet or overmet need for the average student's parent contribution. The information is presented in three tables that parallel the format and information given in Tables 1, 6, and 25.

Table B1, which shows the budget estimates, gives weighted and unweighted estimates. The weighted estimates are the result of applying a set of weights, developed by CIRP, to make their sample of students nationally representative. In Tables B2 and B3, only the weighted estimates are reported.

The unweighted estimates in Table B1 are given for several reasons. One reason is that unweighted data were used for the individual state estimates in the report. Applying weights developed for a national sample to data from one state provides no improvement in representativeness. Thus, for comparison, the unweighted national estimates are also given.

Furthermore, a comparison of the weighted with the unweighted estimates indicates that the students in the CIRP sample were more affluent or attended more expensive institutions than the average student. In every institutional sector and for each income group, the unweighted estimate was greater than the weighted estimate.

The last point to be made is that the overall average for each sector is an average across all fourteen income categories available to the student on the survey questionnaire (See Appendix A) and not an average of the average budgets for the three income groups. Consequently, the overall weighted average for an institutional sector may lie outside the range represented by the estimates reported for the three income groups, as is the case for the private four-year sector.

Tables B2 and B3 need no additional explanation.

TABLE B1

AVERAGE ANNUAL TOTAL STUDENT POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION BUDGET: BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE BY INCOME

Institutional Type and Family Income Group[a]	Group for the United States in 1977 - 78 Budget	
	Weighted	Unweighted
Public Four-Year	3,521	3,818
Low Income	3,269	3,504
Middle Income	3,427	3,725
High Income	3,936	4,185
Public Two-Year	2,656	2,666
Low Income	2,610	2,612
Middle Income	2,583	2,598
High Income	3,024	3,029
Private Four-Year	5,739	6,028
Low Income	5,381	5,680
Middle Income	5,718	6,035
High Income	5,661	5,823
Private Two-Year	4,165	4,304
Low Income	4,006	4,137
Middle Income	4,077	4,209
High Income	4,401	4,582

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles.
Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE B2

NET PRICE AND NET PRICE AS A PERCENTAGE
OF THE AVERAGE ANNUAL TOTAL STUDENT POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION BUDGET:
BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE BY INCOME GROUP FOR THE UNITED STATES IN 1977 - 78

Institutional Type and Family Income Group[a]	Net Price	Net Price as a Percentage of the Budget
Public Four-Year	2,345	67 percent
Low Income	1,409	43
Middle Income	2,399	70
High Income	3,334	85
Public Two-Year	1,607	61 percent
Low Income	1,124	43
Middle Income	1,707	66
High Income	2,517	83
Private Four-Year	3,294	57 percent
Low Income	1,773	33
Middle Income	3,179	56
High Income	4,690	83
Private Two-Year	2,294	55 percent
Low Income	1,488	37
Middle Income	2,398	59
High Income	3,641	83

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles.
Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.

TABLE B3

AMOUNT OF UNMET (-) OR OVERMET (+) NEED
FOR AVERAGE STUDENT'S PARENT CONTRIBUTION:
BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE BY INCOME GROUP FOR THE UNITED STATES
IN 1977 - 78

Institutional Type and Family Income Group[a]	Need
Public Four-Year	+1,113
Low Income	- 475
Middle Income	+ 790
High Income	+4,060
Public Two-Year	+ 971
Low Income	- 322
Middle Income	+ 972
High Income	+4,887
Private Four-Year	+ 936
Low Income	- 624
Middle Income	+ 496
High Income	+4,690
Private Two-Year	+ 547
Low Income	- 552
Middle Income	+ 309
High Income	+3,783

[a]Income groups are defined as follows: low income = total annual income less than $12,500; middle income = total annual income from $12,500 to $30,000; high income = total annual income equal to or greater than $30,000.

Source: Based on data provided by staff of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, University of California, Los Angeles.
Prepared by the Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States.